44781

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Division
Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
JAN 4 1980
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

ELIZABETH MAZURKIEWICZ

Date of Birth — Date de naissance
12. NOVEMBER 1954

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance
ENGLAND.

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe
44. LOVEDAY RD, EALING, LONDON, W.13 9SL.

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse
CASE USAGE AFTER THE NEGATED VERB IN RUSSIAN AND POLISH.

University — Université
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA.

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée
MA.

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade
1980

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse
DR. G. SCHAARSCHMIDT.

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date
18th. Dec. 1979

Signature

NL-91 (4/77)

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NL-339 (Rev. 8/80)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CASE GOVERNMENT OF NEGATED VERBS IN RUSSIAN AND POLISH

by

(C)

ELIZABETH MAZURKIEWICZ

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1980

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled Case government of negated verbs in Russian and Polish, submitted by Elizabeth Mazurkiewicz in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

J. Schaarschmidt
Supervisor

E. Mozejko

DATE July 30, 1975

Abstract

It has been widely accepted for modern Russian that either the genitive or accusative may be the object case for a negated verb, taking into account certain conditions. Effective rules for the choice of case have not been formulated, however, though many theories concerning this subject are in existence. In Polish, it is generally held that only the genitive object may follow a negated transitive verb. This contrastive analysis of Russian and Polish presented with regard to this question is largely based on Russian theory, because of the lack of material on Polish.

The study begins with a critical examination of theories offered to date on case selection in both languages; the theories are categorized under 23 conditions commonly considered to motivate the choice of either the accusative or genitive. There follows a chapter in which examples of Russian and Polish sentences containing negated transitive verbs are listed under these category headings, providing a basis for contrast of the situation in both languages. Case counts for Russian are referred to throughout. Similarities and differences between Polish and Russian are indicated. The thesis concludes by pointing out that Polish may, contrary to popular opinion, admit the accusative after negated transitive verbs in certain situations, and areas of further research are suggested, both for assessing the position of the accusative governed by a negative transitive verb in modern Polish, and for the possible formulation of a rule or rules for case selection in Russian.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	WORK DONE TO DATE ON THE CASE GOVERNED BY THE NEGATED TRANSITIVE VERB IN RUSSIAN AND POLISH	6
3	A CONTRAST OF THE OCCURRENCE OF THE ACCUSATIVE AND GENITIVE CASES FOLLOWING THE NEG. TR. VB. IN RUSSIAN AND POLISH.	47
	Description of procedure	48
	Polish sentences containing a neg. tr. vb. followed by an object noun in the acc. case	49
	List of data from Russian and Polish under the following headings:	
	Generally accepted conditions	52
	Conditions accepted by the majority of researchers	55
	Conditions accepted by a substantial minority	57
	Summary of findings	64
4	CONCLUSION	68
	* * * * * * *	
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	72

I. Introduction

The problem that we propose to examine in this thesis can briefly be stated as follows. In contemporary spoken and written Russian, both the acc. and gen. cases can be selected following a negative transitive verb (neg. tr. vb.), though the choice is governed by certain conditions. In the Polish literary and 'educated' language, only the gen. is offically permitted after a neg. tr. vb. We have, however, collected a small amount of evidence to show that the acc. is used with greater frequency in Polish, in particular, the spoken language, than is generally thought, and that there may even be occasions when it is allowed in 'educated' literary speech. In this introduction we intend to outline the reasons for our study and to indicate the methodology we shall be using. At this stage it would be well to point out that material on the subject of case selection in Polish is extremely scanty, therefore our work will lean heavily towards Russian research and classificational methods.

In older textbooks and grammars on Russian, case selection following a neg. tr. vb. was often said to be limited to the gen. The rule of 'genitive terror' no longer exists, however (though a certain minority still persists in holding to the rule in theory, if not in practice) and there is a clear choice between the acc. and gen. cases following neg. tr. vb. This choice is by no means arbitrary, being regulated by rules that are extremely evasive and difficult to define. The Russian Academy Grammar (1960: pp. 562-563) states that the gen. is normally chosen following verbs of perception, desire, expectation, thought, and that the acc. will be preferred where the subject and predicate are inverted in the sentence, where the object is known in some way, or where the neg. tr. vb. governs an infinitive.

It will become clear in the course of this paper that these guide-lines do not offer a great deal of help to the student of Russian. In mentioning verba sentiendi and desiderandi as requiring the gen., for example, the Academy Grammar avoids the real issue, in that these verbs often take the gen. in the affirmative. Further, case counts like those of Restan (1960) and Korn (1967) have shown that the inversion of subject and predicate does not to any great extent encourage the acc. in preference to the gen. after neg. tr. vb. The Academy Grammar is not alone in creating superficial and unsatisfactory 'rules' for case choice. The great majority of textbooks, grammars and more detailed theoretical works on case usage after neg. tr. vb. contain errors, or at least omissions. Pul'kina and Zaxava Nekrasova's grammar (n.d. p.62) states that the acc. may not be used if the verb functions figuratively and if the noun is not a concrete object. These terms, however, should be employed with greater caution. For instance, how should one interpret the nature of the nouns in the following sentences, in the light of the statements made in the grammar: Ne terzaj moju dušu, ne vospominaj (Fuchs: 1973, p.84); Ona ne znala ego golosa, mogla ne otozvatsja, ispugatsja (Fuchs: 1973; p.85). Would dušu be considered concrete and golosa abstract because the nouns appear in the acc. and gen. cases respectively? If golos is considered abstract, then what are we to make of a statement such as Daleko ty, ne slyšiš o golos moj (Keil: 1970, p.127).

Unbegaun (1957, p.295) states that the acc. will be used where the transitivity of the verb is "suppressed", thus, "If the negation does not preclude the action of the sentence the verb continues to be transitive and takes the accusative." Unbegaun's statement seems too vague to be of any assistance to the teacher or student of Russian. "Suppression of transitivity" is a somewhat ephemeral concept requiring further explanation if it is to be

understood. It is not clear, for example, why transitivity should be suppressed in a sentence such as Rabočie ne pili piva (Unbegaun: 1957, p.295), but not in . . . i voditel' ne videl daže kraj kapota (Keil: 1970, p.132). Neither can we uphold Unbegaun's comment that discrepancies are due to "a certain confusion" in case usage after neg. tr. vb. in Russian. Our experience has shown that the Russian native speaker has little doubt about the correctness or incorrectness of a case choice made by a foreigner, even though he usually cannot explain the reasons for his opinion.

Certain authors, such as Rozental' and Telenkova, Listvinov, Ravič, Druien and others, list the conditions in which the gen. or acc. are obligatory, preferred, unacceptable etc. Such an approach has its advantages, being of considerable value to the learner. Nevertheless, there remains disagreement as to what conditions demand which choice, and there is controversy over whether certain accepted conditions actually play any role in determining case choice after neg. tr. vb. Further, though some researchers (Keil, Timberlake, Fuchs, Thomson and others) have attempted to formulate a universal rule or rules to determine case choice after neg. tr. vb., no satisfactory solutions have as yet been reached.

We hope that the above comments and examples suffice to illustrate the state of uncertainty concerning the selection of the gen. or acc. after neg. tr. vb. in Russian. Restan's count has shown that for almost every condition supposedly requiring an acc. or gen. choice, examples can be found that transgress the 'rule'. It is evident, therefore, that though the existence of a choice between the acc. and gen. is accepted in most modern textbooks on Russian, the majority of them are not clear as to the reasons for the choice. In the course of this thesis we shall be examining theories offered on case selection, comparing them with

data gleaned from various written sources (including case counts) and attempting to evaluate their validity and usefulness.

In Polish, the character of the problem and of research differs somewhat from that in Russian. Polish is probably the strictest of the Slavic languages in holding to the rule of "genitive terror" (Tsurikov: 1967, p.5). Most of the grammars and textbooks examined indicate that the gen. is the only correct case after neg. tr. vb. (Laskowski: 1972, p.55; Szober: 1967, p.601; Schenker: 1973, p.47). However, it is interesting to note that in a very recent grammar by Maria Zagórska-Brooks, the acc. is permitted under one condition, where the neg. tr. vb. governs an infinitive (1975, p.128). Doroszewski (1968) and Buttler (1973) also accept the acc. in these circumstances. In all other instances, the gen. is apparently firmly maintained in literary Polish.

Our research shows that the acc. after neg. tr. vb. may not be as rare, especially in spoken usage, as is generally imagined. In her article on case choice after the neg. tr. vb. in Polish, Pisarkowa (1959, p.30) remarks that sentences such as Takie buty nosić nie będę! and Nie mam zamiaru gotować obiad! are frequently encountered in colloquial Polish. It is quite possible that due to grammatical proscriptivity, many accs. are eliminated from the written language, that might have appeared in the spoken language -- as was apparently the case at an earlier stage of Russian. Since almost no sources of raw data, e.g. case counts, are available to us for contemporary Polish, it is extremely difficult to assess even the approximate extent of acc. usage after neg. tr. vb. in that language. It might indeed be extremely low, or much higher than is normally thought. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to embark upon the collection of raw data. We must therefore limit ourselves to presenting

such material on the use of the acc. in Polish as is at our disposal from written sources.

The chapter following this introduction constitutes a survey of previous work on case selection after neg. tr. vb. in both the languages being investigated. No attempt shall be made at providing conclusive rules for case usage in Russian, as this would be an extremely complex and time consuming task. We shall simply describe the major existing theories on case selection in Russian and Polish; because of the lack of material on Polish, the greater part of the discussion in this chapter will be based on Russian. Since the rule demanding the gen. after neg. tr. vb. is extremely consistent in literary Polish, we shall concentrate on research concerning the use of the acc. in our discussions of this language. Our work on Polish will at times involve theories normally applied to Russian. In this way, the reader will be able to compare the situation in both languages with greater ease.

In Chapter Three we present a list of sentences from both Russian and Polish. The examples on the list are classified under the categories described in Chapter Two (though not necessarily in the same order). From these sentences we hope to illustrate which conditions seem to increase acc. case selection after neg. tr. vb. in Polish, and also to show any similarities between Russian and Polish in case selection. In the concluding chapter, we shall briefly review our findings and propose areas of possible further research.

II. Work done to date on the case governed by the neg. tr. vb. in Russian and Polish.

Below are listed the sections comprising this chapter in their order of appearance. In the brackets alongside the section headings is indicated which case is considered by most researchers to be required by the condition named. (This information is based on Russian due to the lack of material in Polish. Similarities and differences between the two languages will be brought to light in the course of the chapter itself.)

1. Instrumental appositive (acc.)
2. Personal names, animate nouns, proper nouns (acc.)
3. Indirect negation (acc.)
4. Double negation (acc.)
5. Limiting adverbs (acc.)
6. Concrete (acc.) vs. abstract (gen.)
7. Nouns derived from neuter abstract adjectives (gen.)
8. Definite (determinate) (acc.) vs. indefinite (indeterminate) (gen.)
9. Inversion of subject and predicate (acc.)
10. Imperative (acc.)
11. Interrogative (acc.)
12. Pronouns (gen. except for kotoryj -- acc.)
13. -a/-ja stem nouns (acc.)
14. Verbal aspect -- perfective (acc.) vs. imperfective (gen.)
15. Fixed or frozen phrases
16. Quantification (gen.)
17. Intensification of negation (gen.)
18. Verbs of desire, perception, expectation etc. (gen.)

19. Gerunds and participles (gen.)

20. The verb imet' (gen.)

21. Plurals (gen.)

22. ne vidno, ne slyšno/ nie widać, nie słychać (gen.)

23. Formal and informal style (gen. and acc. respectively.)

1. Instrumental appositive.

All the research we have examined lists the presence of the instrumental appositive as leading almost exclusively to the selection of an acc. object after a neg. tr. vb.: "When the sentence contains words which semantically relate simultaneously to the direct object and the predicate, e.g.: ne sčitaju vopros aktual'nym, ne naxožu eti mery sovremennymi; c.f. Ona ne priznaet etu intrigantku svojej dočerju." (Listvinov: 1965, p.193. See also Safarewiczowa: 1959 - 60, pt. I, p.127; Rozental': 1963, p.75;Rozental' and Telenkova: n.d., p.325; Borras and Christian: 1959, p.26; Ravič: 1971, p.261.)

The explanations given for this choice usually refer to the scope of negation, which is said to be limited by the instrumental appositive. Timberlake (1975, p.130), for example, expresses the following views:

> Some transitive verbs (sčitat', nazyvat', naznačat') take an instrumental complement which expresses the capacity in which the verb affects the object. In such constructions the scope of negation extends over the object and the instrumental complement; hence the scope of negation is diffused, and the object virtually never appears in the genitive.
>
> Ja ne smotrju inostrannye fil'my.
> Ja ne smotrju inostrannyx fil'mov. (acceptable, not preferred).
> Ja ne sčitaju inostrannye fil'my interesnymi.
> *Ja ne sčitaju inostrannyx fil'mov interesnymi.

It seems, then, that he feels the intensity of negation is somehow 'spread thinner', having to cover both the object and the instrumental, and thus the object is put in the acc. We would specify this point more exactly, in that the negation is in fact restricted solely to the instrumental appositive. One could for instance conceive of such a sentence: Ja ne sčitaju inostrannye fil'my interesnymi, ja sčitaju ix skučnymi or Ja sčitaju

inostrannye fil'my neinteresnymi, where it is plain in both cases that the ne negates only the interesnymi and thus an acc. would be the likely case choice.

In Polish, the grammatically correct choice of object case after neg. tr. vb. with instrumental appositive is the accusative. Nevertheless, there seems to be some confusion amongst native speakers about which case to choose. Below we reproduce an extract from Pisarkowa's article (1959 pp. 27-28) to illustrate her findings. (The numbers adjacent to the examples refer to the number of informants choosing those versions.)

> Zostawię ją tak smutną . . . Gdyby zaszła potrzeba wyrażenia tego zdania w postaci zaprzeczonej, niejeden Polak znalazłby się w kłopocie. Zdezorientowany stanie przed czterema możliwościami:
>
> nie zostawię jej tak smutną. (8)
> nie zostawię jej tak smutnej. (85)
> nie zostawię ją tak smutną.
> nie zostawię ją tak smutnej. (4)
>
> Pierwsze zdanie jest poprawne. Przymiotne dopełnienie narzędnikowe (smutną) nie podporządkowało się negacji, jego funkcja nieskojarzyła się z funkcją przydawki przymiotnej dopełnienia bliższego (jej) . . . W drugim zdaniu zamiast narzędnika (smutną) równego w tym wypadku biernikowi, użyto dopełniacza. Stało się to tak, jak gdyby przymiotne dopełnienie orzekające (smutnej) było przydawką dopełnienia bliższego (jej) stanowiącego w tym zdaniu opozycję biernika ze zdania twierdzącego. W języku mówionym ta forma jest najpopularniejsza.

It should be noted that the third person feminine pronoun ona has ją for both its acc. and instr. forms, and this can lead to additional confusion for the speaker. Pisarkowa attributes the popularity of the second version to the fact that the speaker perceives the instr. smutną as a modifier of the acc. object, which when the object takes the neg. gen., also must go into the gen. Judging by this extract then, there are times when it is the gen. which encroaches upon the acc. in Polish, rather than

the other way around.

2. Personal names, animate nouns, proper nouns.

Restan has chosen to put all these categories under one heading, that of 'concrete, definite nouns' and has a 56% acc. ratio for all of them together. He does, however, give a separate 76.7% acc. ratio for proper nouns. Clearly then, it is difficult to interpret personal nouns, animate nouns, proper nouns, as leading to acc. usage after neg. tr. vb., because these categories almost always coincide with other criteria. Thus, in many cases we would consider of greater importance not the fact that a noun is a personal name, animate or proper noun, but the fact that it falls into broader categories favouring selection of the acc., such as concrete, determinate, individualized, etc. Listvinov also does not abstract these categories from the set of concrete nouns, but states simply that these nouns are normally found with a concrete meaning, and are therefore put in the acc., as in the following examples containing proper nouns: . . . Svoju Tamaru ne brani (Lermontov) . . . On ne ostavit Petrušu svoimi milostjami (Puškin). (Listvinov: 1965, p.192). Unbegaun and Timberlake consider these categories to be part of a class of individuated nouns, and state that they are put into the acc. because of their individuation, e.g., Nikakuju ženščinu ja ne vižu and Nikakuju mašinu ja ne vižu (Timberlake: 1975, p.125), where the animate noun is at least acceptable in the acc. (in spite of the nikakoj), whereas mašinu is not.

Dobromyslov and Rozental' (1955, pp.209-210), also consider that animate nouns in general take the acc. as objects of neg. tr. vb. Though it cannot be denied, then, that the criteria under discussion may play a part in affecting case choice in Russian, it seems to be more likely that other

interrelated factors are of greater importance.

We have found no material at all discussing the effect of the personal, animate and proper noun categories on case choice after neg. tr. vb. in Polish, Pisarkowa (1959, p.22) does have examples of such nouns in her material, however, e.g. Nie chce pani to dziecko dać przytrzymać mnie? or Przecież ją nie wyrzucisz? In these examples it is possible that word order or special emphasis motivated the use of the acc.

3. Indirect negation.

> If a direct object does not relate directly to a finite negative verb but to an infinitive dependent on that verb, it will generally be in the accusative case:
>
> e.g. ne xotel čitat'etu knigu
> ne mogu priznat'ego pravotu
>
> (Rozental': 1963, pp. 75-76)

The above rule is very generally accepted; in fact, the Academy Grammar (1960, p.563) also permits acc. usage in this context. Restan (1960) and Korn (1967) have a high acc. ratio of 60% and 70% respectively, and the majority of other studies (Šaxmatov: 1963; Finkel' and Bašenov: 1951; Peškovskij: 1956; Davison: 1967; Borras and Christian: 1959; Unbegaun: 1957) seem to be in agreement on this point.

Listvinov, (1965) while seeming to accept the broad premise described above, nevertheless believes that the question of indirect negation is more complex, involving the concrete/abstract dichotomy. He gives two groups of examples containing indirect negation (p.134):

1. Ja ne mogu perečest' eto pis'mo: ono vyrvalos', kak ston. (Turgenev)
2. Ja ne stanu opisivat' etot bal. (Turgenev)
3. No ty ne v sostojanii ponjat' eto prostoe, čestnoe suščestvo. (L. Tolstoj)

4. Nekotorye uže ne mogut sosčitat' svoi gody. (Gorkij)

1. Stixotvorenii pomeščat' ja ne nameren. (Puškin)
2. Ja brodil, kak ten', mesta ne mog najti. (Turgenev)
3. -- Eto ne xorošo ne umet' perenosit' odinočestva, -- skazal on. (L. Tolstoj)
4. Bylo dosadno, čto ja ne mogu pridumat' dostojnoj mesti. (Gorkij)

Listvinov deduces that the first four examples contain accs. because the object nouns have concrete meaning and that the second group contains abstract nouns, which is why they are in the gen. He gives no definition of concrete or abstract, however (we shall discuss this in section 6), but arbitrarily labels nouns as being one or the other. According to him, stixotvorenie is abstract, as is mesto, but bal is concrete. We cannot see what his criteria for abstract/concrete are based on, and feel, therefore, that his statement is meaningless.

Listvinov (p.194) also makes distinctions between the types of finite verbs which can precede the infinitive: "Esli etot glagol polnoznamenatel'nyj ili blizok k polonoznamenatel'nomu, vlijanie otricatel'noj časticy ne rasprostranjaetsja za ego predely i vybor formy vinitel'nogo padeža dopolnenija stanovitsja vpolne opravdannym." This is a point also brought up by Timberlake, Druien and others, who consider that modals and auxiliaries, i.e. verbs linked closely to the infinitive, will normally favour a gen. choice, whereas the so-called 'independent verbs' governing the infinitive will encourage an acc. object. As with the concrete/abstract distinction however, problems of definition make this theory somewhat hazy. In the sentences quoted, moč' is used both with the acc. and gen.; its 'independence' is therefore in doubt and does not serve as a good indicator for choosing one case in preference to another.

Tsurikov (1967, p.125) from the results of his work with native speakers, does not believe that the negated finite verb + infinitive construction affects case choice to any significant extent:

> The following quotations may serve as a further indication that the double verb construction is not the major factor in the choice of case. The first two quotations have the object in the accusative because, in the former, the noun is concrete, in the latter, the noun is modified by an adjective. In the last three quotations the noun, together with the verb, constitutes an oborot reči.
>
> "Dva šestidesjatisil'nyx traktora ne smogli daže sdvinut' truboprovod s mesta." (Ažaev, Daleko ot Moskvy, p.568)
>
> "Nel'zja skryvat' groznuju pravdu v pestryx slovečkax krasiven'koj lži." (Gorkij, quoted from Uglitsky, p.384)
>
> "Ja ne sobirajus' celikom otvergat' opyta zagraničnoj texniki." (Ažaev, Daleko ot Moskvy, p.419)
>
> "Ja ne mogu postignut' takogo sposoba myšlenija." (Nikolaeva, Žatva, p. 446)
>
> "Otstuplenie Krasnoj Armii konečno, ne moglo pošatnut' v glazax Viktora ee prestiža."

Note again that in these examples the verb moč' is used both with the acc. and the gen.

Let us now view the situation in Polish. Henryk Gaertner's Poradnik gramatyczny (1964) requires the gen. at all times with one exception: "Od powyższej zasady wolno odstąpić, jeżeli chce się podkreślić ścisły związek między bezokolicznikiem a dopełnieniem np. Nie wystarczy otworzyć dyskusję, trzeba ją również umiejętnie poprowadzić." (pp.243 -- 244). Prowadzić dyskusję is a set phrase and its elements are indeed tightly linked. An awkward effect would be produced, just as in Russian set phrases, if the case were to be changed.

Doroszewski (1968, p.229) considers that logical stress is the key factor permitting the acc. in sentences with indirect negation, for example, in the sentence Nikt nie jest obowiązany znać wymowę wszystkich języków europejskich he prefers the acc. to the gen. on the grounds that

the phrase Nikt nie jest obowiązany forms a separate logical group to znać wymowę, and the force of negation should not act beyond the boundaries of its own logical group. From this it seems that the scope of negation of the governing verb is important in the fact that it is limited by the infinitive. Pisarkowa (1959, pp. 24-25) holds similar views based on her own research, where she concludes that in an example like nie pragnę widzieć ojca the force of negation does not act directly on the object, thus the functioning of the negative particle is obscured, leading to an acc. For more on this see Buttler, Kurkowska, Satkiewicz: (1973, p.306). The negated infinitive construction with the acc. tr. vb. has even found approbation in one of the more recent grammars, that of Maria Zagórska-Brooks (1975, p. 128).

The evidence we have collected on Polish indicates that the acc. following neg. tr. vb. in an infinitive construction has acquired respectability, and is even on occasion preferred to the gen.

The scope of negation and the lessening of this scope where an infinitive is present are frequently mentioned in discussions on case choice after neg. tr. vb. Timberlake's ideas, for example, can be equally well applied to both Russian and Polish (Timberlake: 1975, p.128):

> Infinitives, as reduced sentences, behave to some extent as independent predicates. For this reason, the object of an infinitive is primarily a complement of the infinitive and only by extension a complement of the finite predicate. The scope of negation is therefore primarily the finite predicate and only secondarily the infinitive plus object. The object of the infinitive is then less likely to be affected by the rule of the genitive of negation than is the object of a simple finite verb.

Timberlake remarks that distancing the object and governing verb in infinitive constructions increases the chances of an acc., a factor also

mentioned in Korn's article (1967, p.495), e.g. Ja ne mogu Vam pozvolit' načat' pisat' stixi.

In Polish, too, Pisarkowa (1959, pp.25-26) has found that the likelihood of an acc. is increased by increase of the distance to the verb, e.g. Czy się nie dziwisz, że nie miała ochoty odwiedzać ten dom?; Nie mam zamiaru gotować obiad!

If we take an example from Russian, Ja ne ljublju pisat' stixi, we see that this utterance can have a number of readings, according to intonation:

a) Ja ne ljublju pisat' stixi (no ja mogu ix pisat')

b) Ja ne ljulbju pisat' stixi (no ja ljublju ix čitat')

c) Ja ne ljublju pisat' stixi (no ljublju pisat' pis'ma)

In (a), the governing verb is negated, therefore Timberlake's theory would apply. In (b), however, it is specifically the infinitive which is negated, due to accentuation, therefore Timberlake's statement is no longer viable. In the final example, an acc. is to be expected (the action itself is not negated), but if the following phrase were removed, possibly a gen. would be approriate. The case choice thus may be affected by intonation and emphasis.

It appears that not only Russian, but also Polish allows accusatives fairly freely after neg. vbs. governing an infinitive.

4. Double negation.

Having surveyed the literature on indirect negation and object case choice after neg. tr. vb., we shall offer some remarks on a related construction, so-called double negation, e.g. Ženščina ne možet ne ponjat' muzyku. (Rozental' and Telenkova, n.d., p.325) In such sentences, the negation does not in fact produce a negative meaning, but serves on the contrary to reinforce the positiveness of the statement.

A substantial number of authors, therefore, believe that double negation leads to increased use of the acc.: Listvinov: 1965, p.325; Safarewiczowa: 1959-60, p.127: Rozental': 1963, p.75: Uglitsky: 1956, p.385. This opinion, however, is not borne out by the statistical data. Restan finds a low 22% acc. Korn (1967, p.495) attempts to explain Restan's low acc. figure by saying that it

> . . . may be due to a reinforcement factor. In other words genitive usage (78%) is reinforced by the proximity of a second negative particle.
>
> Ne Finite Verb Ne Infinitive Noun
>
> This interpretation invalidates the theory offered by a few to the effect that the positive meaning of the double negative (e.g., Ne mogut ne vyzvat' equals mogut vyzvat') encourages accusative occurence.

Our Polish examples with accs. do not contain exactly this type of construction, but one which is very similar, e.g. Ja nie jestem taki człowiek, który by nie oceniał jakąś rzecz. (Pisarkowa: 1959, p.22) As in Russian, such constructions seem to have an emphatic, expressive nature. There is too little data available from Polish to be able to make any comment on this at present.

Though it might be expected, then, that the emphasized affirmation expressed in constructions with double negation would lead to a greater usage of the acc. in both Polish and Russian, this does not appear to be the case, and reasons for the choice of the acc. must lie in other factors.

5. Limiting adverbs.

Judging by David Druien's (1973) case count (Restan's findings are not available to us) the presence of a limiting adverb always leads to an acc. after neg. tr. vb. The majority of other authors investigated

seem to be in agreement with him. 'Limiting adverbs' means those adverbs like čut' ne, edva ne which limit the sense of negation in phrases such as edva ne uronil stakan, čut' ne propustil lekcju. (Rozental' and Telenkova, n.d., p. 325. See also Uglitsky: 1956, p.385.) If one looks at translations of čut' ne, edva ne, into other languages, e.g. 'nearly', 'almost', 'prawie' (Pol.), it becomes clear that the use of a negative expression may simply be a syntactic idiosyncrasy of Russian, an idiom expressed in a negative mode, but where no negation as such is intended -- thus the choice of the acc. for the object case in Russian.

In Polish, the equivalent expressions to čut' ne, edva ne are mało nie and prawie etc. (note that prawie is used without negation). These expressions are to be found in sentences such as Mało nie przewróciłam szklanki and Prawie złamałam zabawkę. We have found no evidence to indicate that the direct object after mało nie is in anything other than the gen., following the general rule.

6. Concrete/abstract.

The worst impediment to meaningful analysis of these two concepts is the lack of a satisfactory definition for concreteness and abstractness. It is beyond our aims in this work to supply such a definition, but we shall attempt to illustrate at least the nature of the problem.

The word orex under most conditions would be considered concrete. In the proverb Ne razgryzja orexa, jadra ne otgadaeš', Tsurikov (1967, p.701) calls the noun abstract because it speaks of nuts in general, and not of one specific nut. This 'abstractness' causes it to be put in the gen. in this context. Such arguments become circular, however, where orex is called abstract because it is in the gen., in order to uphold the theory.

In Rozental' and Telenkova's Praktičeskaja Stilistika, (p. 324-325),

it is stated that the gen. is used after neg. tr. vb. "when the object is an abstract noun, e.g. ne daet osnovanii" whereas acc. is used "when a concrete object" precisely this thing, and not just any thing "is indicated, e.g.: ne proveril rabotu, kotoruju emu prislali; ne vypila moloko, kotoroe ej ostavila mat';" For statements in a similar vein see Rozental': 1963, p.75; Listvinov: 1965, p. 192; Ravič: 1971, p.264; Gladrow: 1972, p.651). Evidently 'concrete' here means something not far removed from 'determinate' -- "precisely this thing, and not just any thing", rather than simply a concrete noun (concrete in the sense of tangible). Again, both rabota and moloko are determinate, whereas it is hard to see how rabota is concrete in the same way as moloko.

Acc. frequency for Restan's count is 55.6% a little over half. This is a substantial amount of accs., but not a significant majority. From his summary it was not clear how Restan defined concrete and abstract. In two of the examples he gives (1960, p.96) it is difficult to see why two different cases are chosen with the same noun after negation on the basis of concrete/abstract: " . . . tak i ne našol dom Bloka", ". . . ne otdadim doma, a, komissar? (gen. sing.)" Context is probably the deciding factor here, but it is unlikely that context could have any effect on the abstractness or concreteness of the noun dom. Dom would probably be put into the accusative or genitive on a basis either of determinate/indeterminate or on some other basis. We do not consider, therefore, that the abstract/concrete distinction is a useful one, due to the vagueness of its terms.

Thomson (1911-12), in dealing with case choice after neg. tr. vb. also considers abstract/concrete crucial to case selection. He uses two examples to illustrate his opinion: (a) ja ne vynul duši and (b) ne vynul ja dušu. According to Thomson, (a) represents an abstract action, where the

motivations for and results of the action are not present, 'a negatively defined state'. Example (b), however, represents the negation of the action alone. The presence of the object of the action -- the existence of the soul in the body -- is not in doubt (p.252). Thomson thus gives his own definition of abstract/concrete, from which we infer that he means nothing other than what later researchers, e.g. Keil (1967) and Timberlake (1975) call total/partial scope of negation. These terms express with greater clarity what Thomson calls 'abstract/concrete', the latter terminology being too ambiguous to be useful.

Timberlake's argument (1975, p.124) that "abstract nouns refer to concepts which inherently cannot be individuated, while concrete nouns may be more or less individuated" is again too loose to be put into practice. The terms 'determinate/indeterminate' (which he puts into a separate category) are more precise in examples such as those in our quotation from Thomson.

Keil has written an interesting work on the topic of scope of negation, in which he takes the stand that in constructions such as u menja ne bylo karandaša, the gen. is used to express the total non-existence of the noun (in this case, karandaš). The relation between u menja and karandaš is destroyed and the existence of the second noun does not take place. Both the action (here,'existence') and the object of the action (in this case, karandaš) do not exist. (1970, p.120) By analogy to this, the gen. is used in negated transitive constructions to express the negation both of action and the object acted upon, whereas the acc. is used to express the negation of the action only: "Die Aufgabe, formal zu kennzeichnen, dass auch das Objekt mitverneint wird, übernimmt in diesem Fall der Genitiv." (p.122) We propose to examine this theory

in the light of Dina Crockett's article on the scope of negation (Crockett: 1977, pp.234-235). Note that the following information can also be applied to Polish.

(a) Boris ne čitaet roman o Srednej Azii.

(b) Boris čitaet ne roman o Srednej Azii.

Utterance (a) has two interpretations -- Boris may not be reading at all (total negation or Keil's negation of Geschehen + Geschehensziel) or he is reading, but something other than a novel on Central Asia; (a) could be followed by On sejčas čitaet stixi., or it could stand alone. (b) however sounds incomplete as it stands, because it can be interpreted in only one way, that Boris is reading, though not the said novel. (b) must be followed by a phrase such as On sejčas čitaet stixi. "This is an interesting fact because the place of the negative particle in the surface structure of Russian sentences is generally assumed to be determined exclusively by the intended scope of denial: the negative particle is said to be placed directly in front of the constituent to which it applies." (Crockett: 1977, p.235) Čitaet in (a) is therefore what Crockett calls an element of "suspended truth" i.e. we do not know whether it is included in the scope of negation or not. It is possible, therefore, that the acc. and gen. may be used in some way to indicate exactly which elements are included in the scope of negation, e.g. Boris ne čitaet romana o Srednej Azii might mean that he does not read at all, whereas on ne čitaet roman etc. might mean that he is reading something. Such a hypothesis requires further investigation of the data to establish its validity or lack of it.

Another -- possibly crucial -- factor mentioned by Keil is the effect of context on case choice after neg. tr. vb. and the problem of reality as perceived by the speaker. In an army manual, Keil (1970, p. 131) has found the following sentence, quoted here with his comments: "Oni ne

zametili ognevuju točku (sie hätten es aber tun müssen)." The writer of the manual is reporting on this event critically, he knew of the signal, its existence was not in question for him, therefore točka is in the acc. (negation of 'Geschehen' only). Keil believes that the soldiers who did not see the signal would use the gen. točki, because they were unaware of it, it was non-existent to them. If, as is highly likely, the choice depends on the perspective of the speaker, it is not at all surprising that it is so difficult to formulate systematic rules.

7. Nouns derived from abstract neuter adjectives.

The category of nouns derived from abstract neuter adjectives is considered by Uglitsky (1956, p.387) to require the gen.: Ne napisat' lišnego. Restan's count, producing a low 13% acc. ratio, appears to support this opinion. Tsurikov's investigations, however (1967, pp.90-92), seem to indicate that the gen. is indeed preferred with such nouns. In the majority of sentences presented to informants, the gen. was selected in preference to the acc. e.g. Nikto ne dumal ploxogo (p.90). Tsurikov suggests that this is due to the indefiniteness of such words. It would be interesting to analyze Restan's data in context, to find out whether this is really so.

In Polish we have found no examples of the acc. with nouns derived from neuter adjectives, only the gen.: Złego diabli nie wezmą (proverb). It seems that these nouns require the gen. consistently after neg. tr. vb.

8. Definite/indefinite (determinate/indeterminate).

We have included definite/indefinite under a separate heading of its own, however it is extremely difficult to isolate this category from many others, in particular, concrete/abstract and inversion. We propose therefore to keep this section as brief as possible and to deal

with the more complex aspects of definite/indefinite as they arise in the discussion of other topics (notably, inversion), rather than creating artificial divisions or risking undue repetition.

The Academy Grammar (1960, p.563) accepts the def./indef. categories as a basis for acc./gen. case selection: the acc. is chosen ". . . esli prjamoe dopolnenie oboznačaet predmet izvestnyj i govorjaščemu, i slušaščemu, ili takoj, o kotorom uže šla reč', napr.: Ne obižaj Ninu; ja bol'še ne vstrečal etu devušku; . . ."

The categories of def./indef. are closely identified with individualization (or lack of it). Thus, Alan Timberlake (1975, p.101) includes definite/indefinite in his participant individuation hierachy for the following reasons:

> A definite participant is understood as a uniquely defined individual within a set of individuals which might conceivably be participants in a given event. A definite participant is therefore more individuated than an indefinite participant, and is less likely to be expressed in the genitive.

In order for a noun to be individuated, then, one must know whether it belongs to a set of individuals from which it can be separated -- that is, context is all-important, and context can mean a number of different things: linguistic, extra-linguistic, even such abstract considerations as the perspective of reality of the speaker. Uglitsky (1956, p.382. See also Ravič: 1971, pp.255-6 and Magner: 1955, p.538) names a good example of what effect context can have on case choice:

> In the play by Simonov, The Russian Question, the discussion centres on a book which one of the principle characters is writing. Here it is interesting to note the constant use of the accusative for the word 'book'. Mne ne xočetsja pisat' etu knigu', 'Esli ja ne vypuskaju vašu knigu', 'Ja ne mogu peredelyvat' svoju knigu.' "

Obviously the book is known and definite, in addition it is modified in all three sentences here, thus individuated, and therefore occurs in the acc. The above statements make it clear that case counts, because they do not take context into account, cannot be of use in determining the extent of definite nouns in the acc. In the second part of the following section we shall survey work done on the interaction of word order and accentuation in determining definite/indefinite, and the influence of all these factors on case usage after neg. tr. vb.

9. Inversion

Borras and Christian (1959, p.26) state that "The accusative will be preferred to the genitive: (a) when the object precedes the verb: On pomnit prošluju vojnu, no pervuju mirovuju vojnu on uže ne pomnit."

Inversion has been widely discussed and commented on as a criterion for acc. case choice after neg. tr. vb. (See Academy Grammar: 1960, p.562; Korn: 1967, p.496; Rozental': 1963, p.75; Uglitsky: 1956, p.383; Listvinov: 1965, p.192.) The data available from word counts does not corroborate this opinion, however. Safarewiczowa has not found a significant acc. predominance with inversion (1959-60, pt. II, p.131) neither has Restan, whose material shows 35% acc. for this construction. In Polish, inversion is also said to encourage the acc., though such constructions are considered to be incorrect. In Buttler's Kultura języka polskiego, we are told that such 'mistakes' come about because the speaker suddenly changes his original speech intentions; for instance, the sentence Chleb dzisiaj nie kupiłam would originally have been constructed in the speaker's mind as Chleb dzisiaj nie został kupiony. (Buttler, Kurkowska, Satkiewicz: 1973, p. 307) Thus it appears that in contrast to acc. with indirect negation, the acc. in inverted constructions is

unacceptable in Polish, in spite of its occurence in colloquial speech. One of the reasons given for the choice of the acc. with inversion, for both Polish and Russian, is that the speaker 'does not know what is coming': ". . . ved' pri postanovke suščestvitel' - nogo pered glagolom govorjaščij možet ne deržat' ešče v ume pri proiznesenii suščestvitel'nogo glagola s otricaniem, i togda padež neizbežno budet vinitel'nyj (etu bumagu. . . ja ne voz'mu)." (Peškovskij: 1935, p.278. See also Pisarkowa: 1959, p.14) This argument does not appear reasonable to us in view of the fact that (a) the standard usage of the gen. in Polish seems to cause little difficulty, the acc. remaining till now the exceptional form and (b), the fact that Restan and Druien's statistical counts show that there is not significant increase in acc. usage with inversion. Safarewiczowa (1959 - 60, pt. II,p. 85) also makes a comment on this: ". . . oczekiwany w tych warunkach (inverted object + neg. tr. vb. -- E.M.) byłby nie biernik, tylko mianownik, tzw. nominativus pendens. Tego rodzaju powiedzenia niejednokrotnie obijają się o uszy i w języku rosyjskim, por. eta bumaga . . . ja ee ne voz'mu." This seems to be a more probable explanation. In any case, Peškovskij's arguments are deficient in that no speaker of any language would be able to utter a coherent sentence unless he 'knew what was coming'.

In formal terms it appears that the distance of the object from the verb is more important than inversion per se for encouraging the acc. after neg. tr. vb. As Tsurikov (1967, p. 148) states: "It seems that the more modifiers there are between the direct object and the verb, the weaker the relation between the two . . . Very often the word or phrase placed toward the beginning of a clause or in the initial position is emphasised or becomes more concrete." In this case, then, inversion is significant

because it is an expression of emphasis or concreteness. Emphasis, though important, is also difficult to analyze, as it is often transmitted by accentuation which is not marked orthographically.

In Polish, too, inversion contributes to the expression of emphasis. Pisarkowa attibutes the 'incorrect' use of the acc. with an inverted predicate to an initial desire on the speaker's part to achieve special emphasis, where, having succeeded in doing so, he is too late to change the utterance on coming to the neg. tr. vb., e.g. Czapkę chyba nie będę wkładała, Takie buty nosił nie będę! (Pisarkowa: 1959, p.26)

If inversion of subject and predicate helps to emphasize or make a noun determinate, leading to an acc. after neg. tr. vb., then we must also give a brief idea of some of the work done on accentuation and word order as such, in order to show how they function. This subject has been investigated by W. Gladrow (1972). In brief, Gladrow works out a system in which accentuation and word order interact to indicate determinate/indeterminate, taking account also of stylistic expressivity. (p.649) The diagram below is his schematization of the theory.

	Determiniertheit	Indeterminiertheit
stilistisch neutral	(1) Poezd / 'prišel	(3) Prišel 'poezd
stilistisch expressiv	(2) 'Prišel / poezd	(4) 'Poezd prišel

Gladrow also mentions the role of gen./acc. after neg. tr. vb. in indicating determinacy/indeterminacy. He believes that case choice acts in concord with word order and accentuation. He states that the acc. will normally be used in a sentence containing inverted subject and predicate,

where the sentence is expressively neutral. The gen. will tend to be used in the final accentuated position of the utterance. In the examples On ne pisal stixov and Stixi ja ne čital, the second sentence is considered determinate (p.652). According to Gladrow's theories, then, given the same word order accentuation can alter whether the noun is to be interpreted as determinate or indeterminate. Let us examine the following sentences: Černov sprosil: -- Svežix svodok ne znaete? . . . Otveta on uže ne doslušal (Davison: 1967, p.55). Davison's translation is: "Chernov asked: "You don't know the latest reports? . . . But he did not hear the answer out." We can present the possibilities of accentuation in the following way (with indications of determinate/indeterminate according to Gladrow's theories given at the side):

(1) 'Svežix svodok ne znaete? (indet./expressive)

(2) Svežix svodok 'ne znaete? (det./neutral)

(3) 'Otveta on uže ne doslušal. (indet./expressive)

(4) Otveta on uže 'ne doslušal. (det./neutral)

Word order can thus only indicate det./indet. in combination with accentuation. In (1) and (2) however, it seems, from Davison's translation (presumably made with knowledge of the context), that the reports are known, or expected in some way, and therefore definite. Thus one would expect the accentation shown in (2) and the object to be in the acc. case. In (3) and (4), since a question has already been asked, an otvet of some kind would be expected, an otvet which would therefore be 'known' and definite -- "he did not hear the answer out". From Gladrow's theory one would expect (4) as the variant to be chosen due to its accentual features (nevertheless, in terms of accent (3) seems to us instinctively quite viable). However, in both (3) and (4), otvet occurs in the genitive,

which makes (3) the only accentual pattern acceptable. In its present form, then, Gladrow's theory does not seem to fit in with his remarks on acc. and gen. The pitfalls of these kinds of theories have been commented on by Wexler (1976, p.47): "It is the inversion of word order which may lead to an interpretation of determinedness/indetermindedness rather than the decision of the speaker to distinguish determinedenss in noun phrases that leads to the inversion." Gladrow's theory, though possibly a good starting point, does not make enough allowances for other factors.

In Polish very little work has been done on word order. Szober (1967, p.320) merely states that old information is placed at the beginning of the utterance and new information at the end. A. Szwedek (1974) has shown that word order can contribute significantly to the expression of det./indet. in Polish. For example, the sentence: W pokoju siedział chłopiec can be followed by Chłopiec wyszedł but not by Wyszedł chłopiec (the latter would mean that another boy went out). Thus, in the following sentences from Pisarkowa (1959, pp.22 and 26):

Czapkę chyba nie będę wkładała.
Morze krwiśmy nie szczędzili.

czapka seems to be definite (though this is difficult to know for certain, without the context being given), as the speaker presumably owns it and it is 'known' to her. Thus an acc. might be expected, following the Russian pattern. On the other hand, morze seems to be indeterminate -- 'a sea of blood', so we might expect the gen., all the more because the rule is strong in Polish. The fact that morze is stressed

and in initial sentence position appears to override the indeterminacy and cause it to be in the acc. As in Russian, word order in Polish seems to fill a number of functions in addition to expressing determinate/indeterminate: it denotes logical stress, expressive emphasis etc., and it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to abstract these functions from one another.

10. Imperative.

From the statistics (Restan gets 53.7% acc., Korn, 40% acc.) it appears that the presence of an imperative does not particularly encourage acc. usage after neg. tr. vb., and that other criteria are more significant. Nevertheless, a number of researchers maintain that the imperative leads to acc. selection -- Borras and Christian: 1959, p. 26; Rozental' and Telenkova: n.d., p.325; Safarewiczowa: 1959 - 60, p.130, and Listvinov, (1965, p.193) who states:

> Posle glagola v povelitel'nom naklonenii, kak pravilo, sleduet suščestvitel'noe, oboznačajuščee konkretnyj ob"ekt, čto i predopredeljaet formu vinitel'nogo padeža:
> 1. Ne peresoli borščˇ!
> 2. Ne ispačkaj kostjum!

Listvinov, then, considers that the real reason behind acc. with the imperative is the abstract/concrete distinction. We have expressed our objections to this theory in a previous section.

Explanations based on the scope of negation seem to produce better results. The existence of borščˇ and kostjum in Listvinov's examples are not in doubt (not even in the 'perceived reality of the speaker') and only the actions are negated, leading to an acc. In a sentence such as Ne omračaj mne prazdnika (Restan: 1960, p.98), there will not be a prazdnik

for the speaker if the hearer continues to cloud it over; the scope of negation extends to the object, which is then placed in the gen.

In Polish we have found no literature or examples at all on the imperative with negation in the written language. Some examples were presented to two native speakers, and only one was accepted in the acc., by one of the speakers: Nie zapomnij kupić wino! The speaker remarked that this would be very colloquial usage. Possibly the indirect negation might have increased the chances of the acc. in this case. The data in and on Polish is at present insufficient to enable us to make definite comment on spoken Polish. In Russian, case choice following neg. tr. vb. in the presence of an imperative appears to rely more on other factors than on the imperative itself.

11. Interrogative.

It would appear from case counts and other studies that the acc. is favoured after the neg. tr. vb. in interrogative sentences. (Restan obtains a 70.4% acc. figure). The situation seems to be the same in Polish.

Timberlake (1975, p.129) states that "In an interrogative sentence the negation of the event is in doubt. A negated question often presupposes that the positive version of the event is in fact true; this is especially clear when a negated question is used rhetorically." The following examples are good illustrations of his point: A ne zabrosit' kuda topor? A počemu ne sozdat' roditel'skie komitety ili detskie komissii? (Uglitsky: 1956, p.385). Jan Cygan (1974, p.302) points out that in the presence of negation, interrogative sentences are doubly marked, once for negation and once for the interrogative mood. This is a possible explanation for the frequent accusatives found, but only on the assumption that the acc. is the marked case for the neg. gen. 'rule'. In our opinion, this

assumption is wrong for modern Russian. It appears, then, that the crucial factor, pointed out by many researchers, is the placing in doubt of the negation in interrogative sentences. Listvinov (1965, p.325) comments that the acc. is usually used "in interrogative and exclamatory sentences, the general meaning of which has no negative overtones, e.g.: Kto,buduči na Kavkaze, ne videl velikolepnuju cep' etix gor? (general meaning: 'Everyone saw it.' As Uglitsky (1956, p.384) puts it, "The use of the negated question seems thus to produce a special stylistic emphasis, which may be reflected by the use of the acc."

We have already remarked that interrogative sentences in Polish also seem to permit a greater number of accusatives than is usual after neg. tr. vb. Just as in Russian, the weakening of the negative overtones appears to encourage the acc. in Polish:
Czy nie można by w artykuły chemiczne zaopatrzyć SAM? (Buttler, Kurkowska, Satkiewicz: 1973, p.306).

A certain type of interrogative, not usually mentioned in Russian studies, is where the expectations of the hearer or speaker are surprised in some way; particularly in these types of questions, Polish seems to encourage the acc. object case (Pisarkowa: 1959, p.22), for instance, Przecież ją nie wyrzucisz? Nie wolisz takie angielskie śpiewanie? Pisarkowa, in her comments on the interrogative, mentions that the use of the acc. in Polish lends emotional colouring to negated questions, a parallel, perhaps, to Uglitsky's "special emphasis" in Russian. From this, it would appear that Polish and Russian show a certain similarity in encouraging the acc. after neg. tr. vb. in interrogative sentences.

12. Pronouns.

We have placed kotoryj separately from the other pronouns on our

list, as it is usually considered to have different characteristics as far as case choice after neg. tr. vb. is concerned -- kotoryj is said to require the acc. case, whereas the majority of other pronouns, e.g. čto, tot, etot etc. are normally said to take the genitive. (See Uglitsky: 1956, Davison: 1967, Restan: 1960.) Restan's count shows that pronouns apart from kotoryj do indeed appear to prefer the gen. after neg. tr. vb. The 52% acc. figure for kotoryj itself does not account for a majority of choices, but only for half the case choices involved. This suggests that criteria other than the mere presence of kotoryj have a greater effect on case choice with this pronoun. Safarewiczowa's results indicate that the function of pronouns is significant in case selection. If the pronoun operates only as an object, then it will probably take the gen.; however, if it has the additional function of linking two phrases -- as does kotoryj -- then it has a high chance of appearing in the acc. (Safarewiczowa: 1959 - 60, pt. II, p. 130). Tsurikov (1967, p.72) attempts a formal explanation of case selection with pronouns:

> Two factors can be considered to explain why the relative pronoun kotoryj, functioning in the subordinate clause as a direct object of the negated transitive verb, is found more often in the accusative case. First, the pronoun kotoryj precedes the negated verb, and second, the pronoun kotoryj is separated from the negated verb by a series of modifiers.

His examples are: "Ta boljačka skoree zaživet, kotoruju ničto ne beredit" and Čudak pokupaet novogodnij podarok, kotoryj potom ne rešaetsja nikomu prepodnesti." (p.55) Tsurikov uses a type of reasoning similar to

Safarewiczowa when speaking about the pronoun čto. He states that the acc. case will be chosen where čto introduces a subordinate clause, e.g. "Aleksej vyložil emu to, čto ne rešilsja skazat' Batmanovu." (Tsurikov: 1967, p.74) The limitations of this thesis preclude us from going any further into the subject of pronouns and case selection after neg. tr. vb. Tsurikov's thesis, Chapter VII, provides further evidence that the case of pronouns following neg. tr. vb. is determined by the same criteria as for ordinary nouns.

We have found no material concerning the role of pronouns and case usage following neg. tr. vb. in Polish, but we have discovered two examples of the acc., one in a proverb, Gdzie kucharek sześć, tam nie ma co jeść, and in the sentence, To nie jest rzecz, ktorą się nie da wyleczyć (Pisarkowa: 1959, p.22). It is interesting to note in the first example, that nie ma requiring the gen. both in Polish and Russian (equivalent to net) takes the acc. in this proverb. Apart from the colloquial nature of proverbs, this is difficult to explain here. In the second example, the acc. may be the result of double negation with strengthened affirmative meaning.

13. -a/-ja stem nouns.

Restan obtains a 47.6% acc. frequency for -a/-ja stem nouns, which though substantial, does no greatly outweigh the gen., particularly in view of the following: in Russian and Polish, in the singular, -a/-ja nouns distinguish a separate case form e.g. lampu/lampę from the gen. lampy. It is impossible, however, to distinguish between the acc. and gen. forms of masculine animate nouns, which are identical to each other. Thus, what looks like a masc. anim. gen. -- ne znaju profesora-may equally well be an acc. -- znaju profesora. The ratio of real accs. in Russian may therefore be much higher than a word count would show.

For this reason, Restan has omitted masc. anim. nouns from his data. This is not a satisfactory solution, however, because it eliminates too large a body of data. (Tsurikov: 1967, pp.33-37). This fact should not be forgotten when examining acc. frequency with -a/-ja nouns. As Tsurikov (1967, p.34) states:

> If one male name, such as Nikita, because of its ending, shows in which case it is being used, but another male name, such as Pavlik, does not give this evidence it does not mean that these two names will be in different cases in the same circumstances. We found several examples where the evidence of case is clear in spite of the identical ending of the genitive and the accusative:
> 'Matka, ty Mikulu šuta ne videla?'
> The form Mikulu proves that šuta, the noun, is also in the accusative case. Therefore, omitting the name Mikulu, will still have the sentence: Matka, ty šuta ne videla? and šuta will be in the accusative case and not in the genitive . . . Ja nikogda ne videla mužčinu vospitatel'ja detskogo sada.

One explanation for the supposedly high incidence of accs. with -a/-ja nouns after neg. tr. vb. is the desire to avoid possible misinterpretations due to homonymy. Korn (1967) enters into great detail on this, attempting to counter the most usual criticism of this theory, i.e. that if homonymy does not lead to greater acc. occurrence with neuter nouns, there is no reason for it to do so with -a/-ja nouns. He shows that fem. nouns with fixed stress, e.g. komnata are both phonemically and orthographically identical in gen. sing. and acc. pl., whereas neuts., e.g. okno are only orthographically identical in these cases (p.442). For this reason he maintains that fem. plurals will tend to select acc. after neg. tr. vb. This does not explain, however, fem. nouns with shifting

stress, e.g. gorá (nom.sing.), gorý (gen. sing.) góry (acc.nom.pl.).

Timberlake (1975, p.131) offers a unique explanation for the supposed frequency of acc. with -a/-ja nouns:

> The difference between the paradigms is that second declension nouns distinguish accusative from both nominative and genitive, whereas the other singular declensions (animate nouns aside) syncretise accusative with nominative. For second declension nouns, assignment of the genitive would obliterate the morphological distinction between nominative and accusative, whereas for other declensions, assignment of the genitive does not obliterate this distinction. For this reason, second-declension nouns are more explicitly characterised as a morphological system and are therefore less appropriate than the other declensions as a context for the genitive of negation.

We do not believe that syncretism is of importance on two counts: (1) it does not affect the great majority of gen. choices made in standard Polish, (2) context in most cases can serve, as it does in Polish, to eliminate possible confusion. These factors, in combination with the masc. anim. question, suggest that the situation with -a/-ja nouns in Russian requires more detailed investigation of the data available, as the presence of an -a/-ja stem may not be a contributing factor at all to the use of acc. after neg. tr. vb.

In Polish, approximately one quarter of the examples we found with accs. as objects of neg. tr. vb. had -a/-ja stems. We have found no mention of this as being a formal factor affecting case selection.

14. Verbal aspect.

It is a widely held opinion that the perfective aspect increases the chances for an acc. case choice after neg. tr. vb. (Rozental' and Telenkova: Prak. Stil., p.325; Thomson: 1911 - 12, p.254; Magner: 1955,

p.534). Restan and Korn have found 40% and 49.2% acc. usage respectively for perfective verbs, which does not seem overly high, but rather a fairly even distribution of accs. and gens.

Timberlake (1975, pp.128-9) states that verbal aspect helps to express the scope of negation because it

> signals a view of the event as a whole, as bounded; in particular it signals that the event has an end point . . . As a consequence, the object of a perfective verb is included in the scope of negation to a lesser extent than the object of an imperfective verb, and it appears in the genitive less often.

Gladrow (1972) includes aspect in his discussion of determinate/indeterminate. His findings are presented below in highly abbreviated form.

gen.	acc.
perfect	imperfect
"konkret - faktisch"	"allgemein - faktisch"
new information	old information
indeterminate	determinate

Gladrow lists the following examples in support of his system:

(a) Včera Valja polučila ot materi pis'mo.
(b) Pis'mo ona mne uže pokazyvala.
(c) Pavel prines knigu.
(d) Knigu Pavel prinosil.

From the above we see that Gladrow's theories produce results in direct opposition to the generally held opinions. According to him, imperfective aspect transmits 'old' information, expresses determinate and therefore favours acc. choice after neg. tr. vb. Perfective aspect transmits 'new' information, indeterminate, and prefers the gen. In On ne pisal stixov (indet.) (-- E.M.) and Stixi ja ne čital (det.) the verb is imperfective. In spite of the fact that the noun stixov in the first of these five sentences is considered by Gladrow to be indeterminate

because of word order and accentuation. This example does not, therefore, corroborate his views on aspect. More study would be required to assess the validity of his theory, at least in terms of case choice following neg. tr. vb. The purely statistical data suggest, nevertheless, "that perfective verbs do not affect the choice of case to a decisive extent." (Tsurikov: 1967, p.110)

15. Fixed or frozen phrases.

The only word count which has this category is that of David Druien (1973). The general opinion on case selection following neg. tr. vb. in fixed expressions falls into two groups. Some scholars maintain that the gen. is always used (Borras and Christian: 1959, p.27; Safarewiczowa: 1959-60, pt. II, p.89). Others differentiate between types of expressions. Druien (1973) for example, states that gen. is more frequent with fixed phrases or idioms, whereas in proverbs, the accusative is chosen under the influence of the same kinds of factors as in non-proverb speech. Tsurikov (1967) is also of this opinion. Concerning the use of the acc. Rozental' and Telenkova (n.d., p.326) state that it is often used "in set phrases, proverbs and sayings, where, in most cases, the object is a concrete noun, e.g.: ne vstavljat' palki v kolesa, ne skalit' zuby; ne roj drugomu jamu; Jajca kuricu ne učat"

We have already pointed out the disadvantages of using abstract/concrete as a means of distinction, e.g. would lokot' and šilo in the following examples be considered abstract or concrete: "loktja ne ukusiš'; Šila v meške ne utaiš'" (Rozental': 1963, p.324). Proverbs by their very nature tend to consist of figurative utterances. In this sense they convey abstract or general meanings by use of more concrete examples. Thus the borderline between abstract and concrete both in

idioms like vtirat' očki and in proverbs becomes somewhat blurred. The speaker ususally intends to convey an abstract meaning when he uses a proverb or idiom, and this may be one of the reasons for all the discrepancies of case usage found in such constructions, e.g. Ne razgryzja orexa, jadra ne otgadaeš' . . . . Ottogo bog žabe i xvosta ne dal, čtob ona im travu ne toločila (Tsurikov: 1967, p. 166).

Uglitsky (1956, p.384) sees the elements of set expressions (not proverbs) as being so tightly associated with one another in a "tight semantic unit" that they keep the original case after negation, whether it is acc. or gen., for example: Daže dver' ne deržit na zapore. Daže samovar ne postavila. Ravič enlarges on this concept: (1971, p.258)

> Slovosočetanija etoj gruppy otličajutsja sledujuščimi osobennostjami: s točki zrenija smysla obščee značenie slovosočetanija ne ravno summe značenij sostovljajuščix ego komponentov: vtirat očki = "obmanyvat'" (t.e. oni obladajut vysokoj stepen'ju idiomatičnosti) . . .

In the case of idioms and proverbs it appears to be almost impossible to make any definite statements as to which case to use. It all depends on the 'fixedness' of the idiom, on its concreteness/abstractness as perceived by the speaker, and on other factors no doubt, such as scope of negation and emphasis. Many of the cases may in addition have simply crystallized as historical usage.

There has been no research done on the use of the accusative after neg. tr. vb. in Polish. We cannot tell, therefore on the basis of our extremely limited material, whether its incidence would be any higher than in normal speech. We have found a tiny amount of examples in our reading, for instance, Gdzie kucharek sześć, tam nie ma co jeść.

16. Quantification.

We have included quantification as one of the criteria most often quoted as affecting the negated object case (see Rozental': 1963, p.74; Rozental' and Telenkova: n.d., p.323; Listvinov: 1965, p.191; Thomson: 1911-12, p.256; Uglitsky: 1956, p.375). We shall avoid going into detail on this subject, for we agree with Safarewiczowa (1959-60) when she says that though it is important in case choice after neg. tr. vb., it is quite as important (both in Polish and Russian) in affirmative utterances, e.g. Russian Nalejte mne soka, or Polish dajcie mi chleba, and thus should be examined as a separate problem.

However, we propose to mention some points which may affect the speaker's perception of quantification.

Timberlake (1975, p.125) states that

> Substance or mass nouns cannot be counted; they can be quantified only by referring to the parameter of part vs whole. Mass nouns (with or without the partitive sense) tend to occur in the genitive more often than count nouns. . . .
> Šokolad ne xočeš'? (Marginally acceptable)
> Šokolada ne xočeš'? (Fully acceptable)

We would not entirely agree with this on the basis of Tsurikov's findings. He gives us examples such as Ja ne ljublju sup(1967, p.42), where the acc. noun was generally more acceptable than the gen. in spite of its being a "mass" noun. The following example showed the same results, Sup nezabud' svarit'. There is a quality here of 'non-quantitativity' in spite of sup being what Timberlake calls a mass noun. As Tsurikov remarks, sup is a type here, indicating soup as opposed to other foods, and thus not a mass or quantified noun. Perhaps this can be clarified by translating the sentence into French rather than English -- 'je n'aime pas la soupe' as opposed to

'donnez moi de la soupe'.

It is clear that not all "mass" nouns are included in the "quantitative" bracket. The acc. may still be used with them when they occur without a quantitative meaning.

17. Intensification of negation.

As Rozental' (1963, p.74) states:

> The genitive case is generally used in the following instances: (a) when the negative force of the sentence is increased by the use of the particle ni or of an adverb or pronoun containing it: e.g. Ne ljublju ni črezmernoj žary, ni črezmernogo xoloda. Nikogda nikomu ne doverjal svoej tajny.

This statement finds support both in Restan's data (14% acc.) and in that of David Korn (1.8% acc., see also Safarewiczowa: 1959 - 60, pt. II, p.127; Listvinov: 1965, p.191; Rozental' and Telenkova: n.d. p.323). Timberlake (1975, p.126) incorporates emphatic negation into his hierarchies of participant individuation, stating that nikakoj and other markers of emphatic negation signal the indefinite and non-specific sense of the noun and emphasize the impossibility of individuating the participant with respect to the event. Whatever the reason, gen. object case after intensified negation seems to be one of the few firm rules for case selection following neg. tr. vb.

We have found no literature on, nor any examples, of, accs. used in the presence of intensifiers of negation in Polish. The gen., e.g. nie zrobiła ani śniadania, ani obiadu, or nie widzę żadnej łódki seems firmly established here in both languages.

18. Verbs of desire, sensation, expectation etc.

The Academy Grammar (1960, p.562) quotes verbs of desire etc. as preferring the gen. after neg. tr. vb. Rozental' (1963, p.74) states that

the gen. is preferred "After the verbs: videt', slyšat', dumat', xotet' želat', signifying perception, desire expectation, etc.: e.g. ne slyšal krika; ne ždal prixoda." (See also Listvinov: 1965, p.191; Rozental' and Telenkova: n.d., p. 323; Davison: 1967, p.48.)

Certain problems arise here, because many of these verbs are often used with the gen. irrespective of negation, and this will affect the choice, as some scholars have pointed out. For example, Timberlake (1975, p.130) states that "Verbs of perception or emotion govern a genitive object historically in Slavic, suggesting that they are a natural context for the expression of quantification." The use of the gen. here may simply be a historical phenomenon or relic. Restan has purposely omitted verbs of desire etc. from his count, and obtains a low acc. frequency (19.8%) with verbs of perception, which tallies with the general opinion. Tsurikov seems to be the only author who attempts to get to the bottom of the matter, by analyzing when gen./acc. are most frequently used in affirmative sentences, and applying this to negated sentences. One of the more important factors affecting choice in affirmatives, according to Tsurikov (1967, p.105) is the def./indef. dichotomy:

> If the direct object is in the genitive case in sentences where the transitive verb is not negated, it remains in the same case when the verb is negated. In sentences where the direct object is in the accusative case in affirmative sentences, the choice of the case with a negated transitive verb will follow the same patterns, which we observed in other chapters (of his thesis -- E.M.)

Unfortunately, Tsurikov presents no examples of negated verbs in such sentences, neither does he appear to have tested his hypothesis on native informants. Thus, though his theory sounds viable, it needs to be verified by data obtained in the field.

We have based this section, as most of our other sections, on data from Russian. In Polish, the gen. is also used with certain verbs in the affirmative, e.g. szukać czegoś. We have found no examples of the accusative in such sentences, and though we must limit ourselves to stating that more data is required before drawing any conclusions, it is highly likely, that strengthened by the gen. of negation rule, the gen. would be even stronger with such verbs.

19. Gerunds and participles.

Gerunds and participles show a high and reliable incidence of gens. after neg. tr. vb. According to Rozental' and Telenkova (n.d., p.324), gens. are used "with a verbal adverb or participle, as a result of the bookish character of these forms, e.g.: ne polučiv otveta starik idet na stanciju (Čex.);. . . Gibnut vdrug, ne dopisav poem (Simon.). Restan (1960) and Korn (1967) come up with a 12% acc. rate for gerunds, which supports this theory. There is very little to add to the above explanation about "bookish form", other scholars give the same reason for the high gen. frequency here -- Uglitsky: 1956, p.387; Korn: 1967, p.490; Timberlake: 1975, p.133. The student is therefore safe in making a gen. choice with the gerund.

We have found no examples of accs. with gerunds in Polish. The gerund and participle are, however, equally 'bookish' in nature in Polish, therefore one would expect them to take the gen.

20. Imet'.

There seems to be some discrepancy in the views held on the verb imet'. Without doubt, case counts show that almost exclusively the gen. is used as the neg. object of this verb (Restan (1960) gets 97% gen., see also Safarewiczowa: 1959 - 60, pt. II, p.127; Korn: 1967, p.491; Rozental' and Telenkova: n.d., p.324). Safarewiczowa believes (p.127) that the high

gen. ratio is because the form imet' is in regression, being replaced by u menja est' type constructions, and therefore holds to the more traditional gen. form. Where imet' does occur in the modern language, it does so in idioms which have crystallized (for whatever reason) historically as gens., e.g. ne imet' vlijanija, prava etc.

Timberlake (1975, p.130) considers the scope of negation as the decisive factor here:

> Transitive verbs of existence or possession imply a high degree of subordination to the object participant to the event; in a sense, the object exists or does not exist only with respect to the narrated event. The subordination of the object to the verb means that the scope of negation includes the verb plus the object as a whole, which makes this class of verbs an appropriate context for the genitive of negation.

Tsurikov's findings are quite different. He concedes that where imet' is part of an idiom it will with all likelihood take the gen., but he thinks that otherwise, apart from the fact that its occurrence in a non-figurative sense is comparitively rare (often confined to scientific or other specialized literature), it has no special characteristics and is subject to the same tendencies with negation as other verbs. Amongst the examples he gives to illustrate his point is: Ne imej sto rublej, a imej sto druzej (Tsurikov: 1967, pp. 64). His statements may well be correct, but he produces little experimental evidence to corroborate them (the only question he gave his native speakers contains an idiom where a gen. was normally preferred in any case). Further study is desirable to obtain a better perspective of his theory.

In Polish, the use of nie ma is extremely widespread, for it is the only way of saying 'there is not' -- Russian net. Thus, where Russian has u menja net knigi Polish has nie mam książki, i.e., Polish always uses the transitive

verb where Russian uses u + gen. We have found no literature on the subject, but it seems to us that this is one context where an acc. after neg. tr. vb. would go very much against the grain of a native Polish speaker. However, we have found two examples of the acc., curiously enough with the pronoun co in a proverb: Gdzie kucharek sześć, tam nie ma co jeść and with the negative pronoun nic, where an acc. is standard usage in any case (niczego is considered substandard) -- Przędzie długa nić, a na wrzeciążku nie ma nic (Riddle: Kasjan: 1976, p.5). In the case of the proverb, the highly colloquial nature of the utterance may have caused an acc. to be used.

21. Plurals.

Much of what we have stated earlier concerning -a/-ja stem nouns and the supposed avoidance of homonymy also applies in this section. Homonymy may be a cause of gen. usage, but this is rather difficult to prove. Restan does not include animate plurals at all in his count, because the acc. and gen. forms of these nouns are identical in the plural, and only context (not always) or modifiers can indicate which case is actually being used. In omitting a significant part of the data, the figures obtained for other plurals (29.9% acc.) may not reflect the real situation. Even if they do, the acc. figure for plurals is very close to that for singular nouns (32.4%) in Restan's count and does not suggest a significantly greater usage of gen. in the plural. In Tsurikov's words (1967, p.49);

> . . . we must exclude the category of animate nouns of all genders in the plural from research, while pointing out that the lack of evidence does not prove that these nouns, used as direct objects in clauses with negated transitive verbs, will always be in the same case.

Tsurikov's questioning of native speakers may be the most efficient method of studying case choice with plurals. His findings indicate that other factors -- determinacy/indeterminacy, for instance, play a big role. He gives the following sentences and the results he obtained (p.50):

(a) Ne pokupajte takie dorogie veščí.

(b) Ne pokupajte takix dorogix veščej.

Tsurikov argues (p.54):

> The phrase takie dorogie veščí refers to things already purchased. The phrase takix dorogix veščej refers to a situation: "Don't buy such expensive things. You are already in debt." It seems, then, that the accusative can be used with plural nouns, as with singular nouns, to indicate "definiteness" or a known quantity or type.

We have found no mention of plurals in the literature on acc. usage after neg. tr. vb. in Polish, though we have several examples in the data collected, e.g. Takie buty nosiŕ nie będę! (Pisarkowa: 1959, p.26). These accusatives seem to be due to emphasis and the underlining of 'known' or 'definite' which must be strong if it produces sentences defying the firm gen. after negation rule in Polish.

22. ne vidno, ne slyšno -- Pol: nie widać nie słychać.

Restan has found one acc. after neg. tr. vb. as compared with 16 gens. with the verbs ne vidno, ne slyšno: Zanaveste okna, čtoby ne vidno bylo svet skvoz' ščeli staven (Restan: 1960, p.102). We have found no evidence concerning these particular constructions to indicate that the acc. has a higher occurence than Restan's figures show. However, Ravič (1971, p.262), lists the acc. as the preferable case form with other impersonal constructions, e.g.: Ni odnu ulicu ne zamelo snegom;

Sestru ne tošnilo.

In Polish, it seems that impersonal constructions hold firmly to the genitive, e.g. Zasłońcie okna, żeby nie widać było światła przez strzeliny w okiennicach (native informant).

23. Formal vs. informal style.

The accusative at one time was generally held to be colloquial, the gen. being the correct literary form. Magner (1955), for instance, believes that colloquial and literary speech should be separately examined, constituting two different styles with different usage. We think that enough has been written in this chapter to show that nothing can be further from the truth, and that the acc. is now as accepted in literary forms as in the colloquial language. However, the fact that schools, grammars, and textbooks so long regarded gen. as the only correct case may cause many writers to keep the gen. in spite of natural inclinations towards the acc. We have already mentioned, for example, that gerunds and participles, because of their limitation largely to written utterances are extremely formal and almost always take the gen. In effect, however, the acc. seems to have become so established, that in certain sentences the gen. is referred to by native speakers as 'non-grammatical', 'probably used by uneducated speakers'. This is in accord with Timberlake's (1975, p.133) findings:

> The genitive, depending on the hierararchy, is stylistically relatively more formal (in the range from neutral to formal to old-fashioned to archaic) than the accusative (in the range from substandard to colloquial to neutral). (From our statement above, this could apparently be applied to the accusative. -- E.M.) . . . It is because of this stylistic hierarchy that the accusative is relatively more common to colloquial speech than in literary Russian. Further, it is because of this stylistic hierarchy that participles and gerunds, which are stylistically inherently literary forms, consistently take the genitive of negation.

Style, in many cases, together with context, may be the only explanation for an otherwise 'inexplicable' acc. or gen.

In Polish, style seems to be the crucial factor in the choice of an acc. Most of the contemporary examples presented by Pisarkowa (1959) are from colloquial sources, overheard, possibly on the radio or elsewhere. Because the gen. after negation rule in Polish is definitely firmly established style and unusual emphasis must surely be held responsible for many of the accs. that accidentally slip out. Pisarkowa (1959) did not do a formal count in Polish prose, partly because she feared that any accs. would be eliminated by editors. In fact, in Polish some kind of spoken data -- collected perhaps on a tape recorder -- would be highly desirable to assess the real status of the acc. after neg. tr. vb. in colloquial speech, where the constraints of proscriptive grammar are much weaker.

III. A contrast of the occurrence of the accusative and genitive cases following neg. tr. vb. in Polish and Russian.

This chapter shall begin with a list of all the sentences found in Polish containing the accusative case following neg. tr. vb. and a few containing a gen. object. The sentences are numbered according to their order on the list, and shall be given their original references only on this list. Subsequently they will be referred to by number alone.

In the main body of the chapter are listed conditions for the selection of either gen. or acc. after neg. tr. vb. in Russian. These conditions appear in the order of their acceptance by scholars, as given by R. Druien: 1973, p.38. We do not include the criteria 'concrete/ abstract', as we consider the definition of these concepts to be too problematic. Adjacent to each section heading we give Restan's statistical finding, if available to us. (Unfortunately, we did not have access to his full thesis, only to the summary (1960).) Under each condition heading are presented examples from Russian to illustrate case usage in the presence of the named condition. Where possible, examples containing both the acc. and the gen. shall be given, in order that the reader may compare them.

Following the Russian examples, examples from Polish are presented, of sentences containing the acc. after neg. tr. vb. in the presence of the given condition. Generally, examples containing the gen. shall not be given for Polish, as this case represents standard, accepted usage, and examples of the gen. following neg. tr. vbs. are abundant in any written text. If, however, no acc. has been found by us in Polish for a certain condition, then an example containing the gen. will be given. Further brief remarks shall, if necessary, be found in the body of the text. In

all sentences, the object is in italics (underlined) whether this was so in the original text or not.

After our presentation of the data, we shall summarize and comment on the incidence of the acc. following neg. tr. vb. in Polish, as compared to Russian. We shall not make any detailed comment on Russian, as we have dealt fairly thoroughly with the theories on Russian in our previous chapter.

Our study of the acc. following neg. tr. vb. in Polish is based almost entirely on the background of previous studies done on Russian. Though we have criticised certain criteria for case choice of gen. or acc. in the previous chapter, it is beyond the bounds of this thesis to embark on working out a new set of classifications, thus we include almost all the section headings previously examined in the present chapter, whether or not we earlier expressed approval or disapproval of them as such. Our purpose is simply to compare and contrast case selection in Polish and Russian, on the basis of limited data as far as Polish is concerned, within the framework of categories already evolved for Russian.

Polish sentences containing a neg. tr. vb. followed by an object noun in the accusative case.

(Abbreviations: (R) -- heard over the radio
(Sp) -- from spoken speech (overhead)
(Inf) -- example obtained from a native informant by us.
The underlined heading indicates that all the sentences below that heading were taken by us from the source named. Primary sources may or may not be indicated adjacent to these headings, according to whether they were given in the secondary source.)

Pisarkowa: 1959, p.22.

1. To nie jest rzecz, którą się nie da wyleczyć. (Sp)
2. Nie zawahał się poświęcić twoją ojczyznę. (R)
3. Ja nie jestem taki człowiek, który by nie ocenial jakąś rzecz. (Sp)
4. Morze krwiśmy nie szczędzili. (R)
5. Dlaczego nie zamkniesz okno? (R)
6. Czybyśmy wtedy raz dwa nie zlikwidowali to chuligaństwo? (R)
7. Nie chce pani to dziecko dać przytrzymać mnie? (Sp)
8. Nie wolisz takie angielskie śpiewanie? (Sp)
9. Nie możesz znaleźć talerz na chleb? (Sp)
10. Nie zrobiłam ci to ładną laleczkę?
11. Przecież ją nie wyrzucisz?

Pisarkowa: 1959, p.23.

12. Nie kupowałam jeszcze nigdy dwie paczki papierosów.
13. Nie mogę ci dać wszystko, jakbyś chciała.
14. Jeszcze nie poprawiłam na dzisiaj te błędy.

Pisarkowa: 1959, p.25.

15. Nie chcę sprawę rozdmuchać.
16. Mogłaby ciotka nie bić te koty.
17. Nie skończyłam jeszcze czytać książkę.

18. Ja nie zabraniałam mu pić czystą.

Pisarkowa: 1959, p.26.

19. Czy się dziwisz, że nie miała ochoty odwiedzać ten dom?

20. Nie mam zamiaru gotować obiad!

21. Czapkę chyba nie będę wkładała.

22. Jak mi tę lalkę nie ułożysz porządnie!

23. Takie buty nosił nie będę!

Pisarkowa: 1959, p.27.

24. Bowiem te rachityczne dźwięki, które sączą się przez głośnik, żadną miarą nie można nazwać muzyką. (R)

Buttler, Kurkowska, Satkiewicz: 1973, p.307.

25. Nie uważał sobie za ujmę zamienić z nią kilka słów.

26. Handlarka nie uważała za stosowne trzymać język za zębami.

27. Nawet zaśniedziałemu austriackiemu biurokracie nie przyszłoby na myśl unieważnić dokument.

Doroszewski: O kulturę słowa (1968), p.229.

28. Czy nie powinien porozmawiać z nią, wzbudzić w niej wiarę i wzmocnić nadzieję?

29. Nikt nie jest obowiązany znać wymowę wszystkich języków europejskich.

Gaertner, Passendorfer, Kochański: 1964, p.244.

30. Nie wystarczy otworzyć dyskusję, trzeba ją również umiejętnie poprowadzić.

Kasjan: 1976, p.5.

31. Przędzie długa nić, a na wrzeciążku nie ma nic (Riddle)

Proverbs.

32. Gdzie kucharek sześć, tam nie ma co jeść.

33. Słowami się nic nie najesz.

34. Złego diabli nie wezmą.

35. Co napisane, tego i siekierą nie wyrąbiesz.

36. Czego oko nie widzi, tego sercu nie żal.

From native informant

37. Wino nie zapomnij kupić! (Native informant said that this can be heard, but considered it substandard)

38. Nie licząc jedną bułkę, nie mamy chleba w domu. (as above)

I. Generally accepted conditions.

For acc. case choice.

i. Presence of instrumental appositive. (Restan. -- 1 gen./11 accs.)

Russ. . . . literaturnyj uroven' mnogix gazet i žurnalov nel'zja priznat' udovletvoritel'nym. (Restan: 1960, p.100. All subsequent quotes from Restan are from here and the year will not be indicated)
Poetomu mne kažetsja, nel'zja priznat' posledovatel'nym sledujuščego opredelenija vinitel'nogo neopredel'ennym . . . (Restan, p.100)

Pol. Bowiem te rachityczne dźwięki, które sączą się przez głośnik, żadną miarą nie można nazwać muzyką. (24)

ii. Personal names, animates, proper nouns, (Restan -- 76% acc.)

Russ. . . . ne ponimaju ja Sonju. (Restan, p.97)

On ne videl Soni. (Restan, p.97.)

Pol. Nie rozumiem Sonię. (Inf. told us that this 'can be heard' but is substandard.)

Nie rozumiem Sonii. (Inf. accepted this completely.)

iii. Object dependent on infinitive governed by neg. vb. (Restan — 60.1% acc.)

Russ. . . . voobšče ne mogu videt' gibel' čeloveka na ulice. (Restan, p.95.)

Ja etogo pis'ma pročest' ne mogu! . . . (Restan, p.95)

Pol. Bowiem te rachityczne dźwięki, które sączą się przez głośnik, żadną miarą nie można nazwać muzyką. (24)

To nie jest rzecz, którą się nie da wyleczyć. (1)

Nie zawahał się poświęcić twoją ojczyznę. (2)

Nie chce pani to dziecko dać przytrzymać mnie? (7)

Nie możesz znaleźć talerz na chleb? (9)

Czy nie powinien porozmawiać z nią, wzbudzić w niej wiarę i wzmocnić nadzieję? (28)

Nikt nie jest obowiązany znać wymowę wszystkich języków europejskich. (29)

Nie mogę ci dać wszystko, jakbyś chciała. (13)

Nie chcę sprawę rozdmuchać. (15)

Nie skończyłam jeszcze czytac książkę. (17)

Ja nie zabraniałam mu pić czystą. (18)

Nie mam zamiaru gotować obiad! (20)

Czy się dziwisz, że nie miała ochoty odwiedzać ten dom? (19)

Nie uważał sobie za ujmę zamienić z nią kilka słów. (25)

Handlarka nie uważała za stosowne trzymać język za zębami. (26)

Nie wystarczy otworzyć dyskusję, trzeba ją również umiejętnie poprowadzić. (30)

Nawet zaśniedziałemu austriackiemu biurokracie nie przyszłoby na myśl unieważnić dokument. (27)

For gen.case choice.

i. Quantitative nuance of the object. (Restan -- only 1 acc.)

Russ. A produktov ne vezut. (Restan, p.102)

. . . sledit' čtob onyj pekar' ne voroval muku, jajca, maslo i vypečennyj tovar. (Restan, p.102)

Pol. We have found no examples of objects with quantitative meaning appearing in the acc. However, it would appear that the use of the gen. in the following sentences: no's. 13, 18, 20, 25, 32, would impart a quantitative meaning to the object noun.

ii. The presence of intensifiers of negation. (Restan -- 4% acc.)

Russ. Nikakoj dopolnitel'noj platy . . . naselenije derevni vzimat' prava ne imeet. (Restan, p.101)

No my ne budem zdes' privodit' ni statističeskij, ni meteorologičeskij material . . . (Restan, p.101)

Pol. On nie widział ani matki, ani ojca. (Inf.)

Nie kupowałam jeszcze nigdy dwie paczki papierosów. (12)

iii. Verbs of perception, desire, expectation. (Restan -- 19.8% acc. for verbs of perception.)

Russ. Ja poprežnemu ne vižu zemli. (Restan, p.100)

Teper' eti bezžiznennye sxemy uže nikto bol'še ne vspominaet. (Restan, p.101)

Pol. Czy się dziwisz, że nie miała ochoty odwiedzać ten dom? (19)

Nie chce pani to dziecko dać przytrzymać mnie? (7)

II. Conditions accepted by the majority of researchers.

For acc. case choice.

i. Presence of limiting adverbs, e.g. čut' ne, edva ne, (mało nie) (Restan -- 0% acc.)

Russ. . . . čut' ne propustil svoju očered'. (Borras and Christian: 1957, p.301)

Pol. Ostrożnie, mało nie złamałeś aparatu. (Inf.)

ii. Inversion of subject and predicate. (Restan -- 35.2% acc.)

Russ. Dorogu v gorod . . . ukazal mne . . . soldat. (Unbegaun: 1957, p.301)

Otveta on uže ne doslušal. (Davison: 1967, p.55).

Pol. Morze krwiśmy nie szczędzili. (4)

Przecież ją nie wyrzucisz? (11)

Czapkę chyba nie będę wkładała. (21)

Jak mi tę lalkę nie ułożysz porządnie! (22)

Takie buty nosił nie będę! (23)

Bowiem te rachityczne dźwięki, które sączą się przez głośnik, żadną miarą nie można nazwać muzyką. (24)

iii. Use of proverbs. (no statistical data found by us.)

Russ. Kašu maslom nie isportiš'. (Druien: 1973, p.76)

Komar nosu ne podtočit. (Druien: 1973, p.77)

Pol. Przędzie długa nić, a na wrzeciążku nie ma nic. (31)

Co napisane, tego i siekierą nie wyrąbiesz. (35)

Gdzie kucharek sześć, tam nie ma co jeść. (32)

Słowami się nic nie najesz. (33)

(N.B. nic, the accusative form, is standard usage in the object case after neg. tr. vb. in Polish. The gen. niczego sounds pedantic and unnatural here.)

iv. Where noun is 'known' or definite. (R. gives 55.6% acc. frequency for "concrete, definite nouns".)

Russ. . . . tak i ne našel dom Bloka. (Restan, p.96)

. . . ne otdadim doma, a, komissar? (gen. sing. Restan, p.96)

Pol. As the majority of sentences in our sample appear to have known or definite object nouns, we shall present only two examples below.

Przecież ją nie wyrzucisz? (11)

Jeszcze nie poprawiłam na dzisiaj te błędy. (14)

For gen. case choice.

i. Use of fixed phrases and idioms apart from proverbs. (No statistical data found.

Russ. Ne smykat' glaz. (Druien: 1973, p.77)

Čelovek, kotoryj ne mog nažit' sebe sostojanie. (Uglitsky: 1956, p.384)

Pol. Nie zawracaj mi głowy. (Inf.)

Nie zwracaj na niego uwagi. (Inf.)

ii. Object noun has conotations of indefiniteness. (R. -- 44.4% gen. for "indefinite abstract objects".)

Russ. Ja ne našel cvetov. (Timberlake: 1975, p.125)

Pol. N.B. We base our criteria for indefiniteness of the noun on whether an English indefinite article or any would be used in translation.

Morze krwiśmy nie szczędzili. (4)

Nie zrobiłam ci to żadną laleczkę? (10)

Nie uważał sobie za ujmę zamienić z nią kilka słów. (25)

III. Conditions accepted by a substantial minority of researchers.

For acc. case choice.

i. Presence of infinitive plus 'independent verb'. (No statistical data found.)

Russ. Mat' ne sovetovala svoej dočeri čitat' priključenčeskie povesti. (Druien: 1973, p.90)

- - Eto ne xorošo ne umet' perenosit' odinočestva - - skazal on. (Listvinov: 1965, p.194)
Note the difficulty in such examples of assessing the 'independence' of the governing verb.

Pol. Nie zawahał się poświęcić twoją ojczyznę. (2)

Nie chce pani to dziecko dać przytrzymać mnie? (7)

Nie chcę sprawę rozdmuchać. (15)

Nie skończyłam jeszcze czytać książkę. (17)

Ja nie zabraniałam mu pić czystą. (18)

Czy się dziwisz, że nie miała ochoty odwiedzać ten dom? (19)

Nie mam zamiaru gotować obiad! (20)

Nie uważał sobie za ujmę zamienić z nią kilka słów. (25)

Handlarka nie uważała za stosowne trzymać język za zębami. (26)

Nawet zaśniedziałemu austriackiemu biurokracie nie przyszłoby na myśl unieważnić dokument. (27)

Nie wystarczy otworzyć dyskusję, trzeba ją również umiejętnie poprowadzić. (30)

ii. Informal colloquial style.

Russ. We refrain from giving examples, as style can only really be ascertained in context. It seems to us that the acc. is now freely used also in literary speech - - see section on style in previous chapter.

Pol. As can be seen from the references given in the list of sentences containing the acc. after neg. tr. vb., the great majority of our examples are from colloquial sources, and we shall refrain from giving individual examples here.

For gen. case choice.

i. Presence of an infinitive plus modal auxiliary. (No statistical data found.)

Russ. Student ne mog najti pravil'nogo rešenija zadači. (Druien: 1973, p.90)

On ne umel tak točno kak Vasilij vyražat' svoi mysli. (Tsurikov: 1967, p.121)

Pol. Bowiem te rachityczne dźwięki, które sączą się przez głośnik, żadną miarą nie można nazwać muzyką. (24)

To nie jest rzecz, którą się nie da wyleczyć. (1)

Nie możesz znaleźć talerz na chleb? (9)

Czy nie powinien porozmawiać z nia, wzbudzić w niej wiarę i wzmocnić nadzieję? (28)

Nie mogę ci dać wszystko, jakbyś chciała. (13)

ii. Formal style

Russ. For the same reasons as given under the heading Informal style, we refrain from giving examples here.

Pol. We shall give here only those examples with the acc. that we know have come originally from a written source.

Nie uważał sobie za ujmę zamienić z nią kilka słów. (25)

Handlarka nie uważała za stosowne trzymać język za zębami. (26)

Nawet zaśniedziałemu austriackiemu biurokracie nie przyszłoby na myśl unieważnić dokument. (27)

Nikt nie jest obowiązany znać wymowę wszystkich językow europejskich. (29)

Nie wystarczy otworzyć dyskusję, trzeba ją również umiejętnie poprowadzić. (30)

iii. Gerunds and participles. (R.-- 12% acc.)

Russ. . . . ne raskryvaja parašuta. (Restan, p.100)

. . . ne sčitaja kvartiru i prodovol'stvije. (Restan, p.100)

Pol. Nie licząc jedną bułkę, nie mamy chleba w domu. (38)

Nie otwierając okna, on stał i patrzył na nich. (Inf.)

IV. Less generally accepted conditions.

For acc. case choice.

i. Presence of the imperative.(R.-- 53.7% acc. not including fixed phrases such as 'ne obraščaj vnimanija'.)

Russ. Ne progloti igolku. (Restan, p. 98)

Černil ne oprokin'te. (Restan, p.98)

Pol. Wino nie zapomnij kupić! (37)

Jak mi tę lalkę nie ułożysz porządnie! (23)

ii. Interrogative sentences. (R. -- 70.4% acc.)

Russ. A počemu ne sozdat' roditel'skije komitety ili detskije komissii? (Restan, p.98)

Nu kak ne snjat' šapki i ne poklonit'sja do zemli. (Restan, p.98)

Pol. Dlaczego nie zamkniesz okno? (5)

Czybyśmy wtedy raz dwa nie zlikwidowali to chuligaństwo? (6)

Nie chce pani to dziecko dać przytrzymać mnie? (7)

Nie wolisz takie angielskie śpiewanie? (8)

Nie możesz znaleźć talerz na chleb? (9)

Nie zrobiłam ci to ładną laleczkę? (10)

Przecież ją nie wyrzucisz? (11)

Czy się dziwisz, że nie miała ochoty odwiedzać ten dom? (19)

Czy nie powinien porozmawiać z nią, wzbudzić w niej wiarę i wzmocnić nadzieję? (28)

iii. Presence of 'kotoryj'/'który'. (R. - 52% acc.)

Russ. . . . (vnimanije), kotorogo ja ne zaslužil . . . (Restan, p. 103)

. . . otvetil Saburov s toj spokojnoj logikoj, kotoruju v nem osobenno ne ljubil večno spešivšij Babčenko. (Restan, p.103)

Pol. To nie jest rzecz, która się nie da wyleczyć. (1)

iv. The object is an-a/-ja stem singular noun. (Restan: 47.6% acc.)

Russ. . . . ni odna iz storon ne ustupila by drugoj kakuju-libo territorju ili naselenie. (Restan, p.95)

. . . ne možet ne vyzvat' trevogi i ozabočennosti u vsex tex, kto . . . (Restan, p.96)

Pol. Nie zawahał się poświęcić twoją ojczyznę. (2)

Nie zrobiłam ci to ladną laleczkę? (10)

Nie chcę sprawę rozdmuchać. (15)

Nie skończyłam jeszcze czytać książkę. (17)

Ja nie zabraniałam mu pić czystą. (18)

Czapkę chyba nie będę wkładała. (21)

Jak mi tę lalkę nie ułożysz porządnie! (22)

Czy nie powinien porozmawiać z nią, wzbudzić w niej wiarę i wzmocnić nadzieję? (28)

Nikt nie jest obowiązany znać wymowę wszystkich języków europejskich. (29)

Nie wystarczy otworzyć dyskusję, trzeba ją również umiejętnie poprowadzić. (30)

Nie licząc jedną bułkę, nie mamy chleba w domu. (38)

v. The verb occurs in the perfective aspect. (R. -- 40.1% acc.)

Russ. . . . my ne narušim etot mir. (Restan, p.98)

Ona byla ne v silax sderžat' rydanija. (Restan, p.98)

Pol. As the vast majority of our examples contain the perfective (if a choice is possible on other grounds) we shall present only two examples below for illustrative purposes.

Jeszcze nie poprawiłam na dzisiaj te błędy. (14)

Nie skończyłam jeszcze czytać książkę. (17)

vi. Presence of a double negative with an affirmative meaning.

(Restan: 22.2% acc.)

Russ. U narodov ne mogut ne vyzvat' takže serjoznuju trevogu plany ispol'zovat'. (Restan, p.99)

. . . ne možet ne vyzvat' trevogi i ozabočennosti. (Restan, p.101)

Pol. To nie jest rzecz, którą się nie da wyleczyć. (1)

Ja nie jestem taki człowiek, który by nie oceniał jakąś rzecz. (3)

For gen. case choice.

i. Presence of the verb 'imet' ' (Restan - 2.6% acc.)

Russ. Nastojaščej revoljucii v cerkvii my poka ešče ne imeem. (Restan, p.101)

. . . ix pozicija . . . ne imeet rešajuščee značenie dlja bezopasnosti SŠA. (Restan, p.101)

Pol. Nie mam zamiaru gotować obiad! (20)

Czy się dziwisz, że nie miała ochoty odwiedzać ten dom? (19)

Gdzie kucharek cześć, tam nie ma co jeść. (32)

ii. The object noun is an abstract neuter adjective used substantively. (Restan - 13% acc.)

Russ. Poslednego nel'zja skazat' pro bol'šinstvo ispolnitelej. (Restan, p.103)

. . . protiv lic, ne ispolnjajuščix vyšeizložennoje. (Restan, p.103)

Pol. Złego diabli nie wezmą. (34)

iii. The object is a pronoun apart from 'kotoryj', and one which does not link two clauses.

(a) to (Restan -15% acc.)

Russ. Ne podobaet čestnym revoljucioneram obxodit' molčaniem togo. čto . . . (Restan, p.103)

. . . ne otricajut oni i to, čto . . . (Restan, p.103)

Pol. Co napisane, tego i siekierą nie wyrąbiesz. (35)

Czego oko nie widzi, tego sercu nie żal. (36)

(b) čto/co (Restan - 23% acc.)

Russ. Drugoj graždanin pisat' znajet, a pročest', čego napisal - ne možet. (Restan, p.103)

. . . Samoje glavnoje, čto ne vyraziš' nikakimi ciframi. (Restan, p.103)

Pol. Czego oko nie widzi, tego sercu nie żal. (36)

Gdzie kucharek sześć, tam nie ma co jeść. (32)

iv. The object noun is a plural. (Restan - 29.9% acc.)

Russ. . . . grafa Tolstogo sočinenij ne slučalos' čityvat'? (Restan, p.97)

Ja . . . prjamo ne pojmu vaši obidy. (Restan, p.97)

Pol. Nie kupowałam jeszcze nigdy dwie paczki papierosów. (12)

Jeszcze nie poprawiłam na dzisiaj te błędy. (14)

Mogłaby ciotka nie bić te koty. (16)

Takie buty nosił nie będę! (23)

Bowiem te rachityczne dźwięki, które sączą się przez głośnik, żadna miarą nie można nazwać muzyką. (24)

v. The verb occurs in the imperfective aspect. (Restan - 59.9% acc.)

Russ. Xirurgi naryv razrezajut. (Uglitsky: 1956, p.385)

Do vas nikto ešče etogo brasleta ne nadeval. (Rozental' and Telenkova, n.d., p.323.)

Pol. Ja nie jestem człowiek, który by nie oceniał jakąś rzecz. (3)

Nie kupowałam jeszcze nigdy dwie paczki papierosów. (12)

Czy się nie dziwisz, że nie miała ochoty odwiedzać ten dom? (19)

(N.B. We have not included verbs here which have only an imperfective form, or where perfectivization would also alter the meaning.)

vi. Presence of the verbs, 'ne vidno', 'ne slyšno'/'nie widać','nie słychać' (Restan - 1 acc./ 16 gens.)

Russ. . . . ne slysno šuma. (Restan, p.102)

Zanaves'te okna, čtoby ne vidno bylo svet skvoz' ščeli staven. (Restan, p.102)

Pol. Zasłońcie okna, żeby nie widać było światła przez szczeliny w okiennicach. (Inf.)

Summary of results.

(Note: Polish sentences containing nic as the object of a neg. tr. vb. shall not be included in these results.

'Marg(inal)' refers to such cases where the informant admitted that the sentence could be heard, but that he considered it substandard.)

Conditions considered to favour acc. case choice	no. or % of accs.	
	Pol.	Russ.
Instrumental appositive	1	1 gen./1 acc.
Personal names, proper nouns, animates	1 (marg.)	76% (56% for proper nouns)
Object dependent on infin. + neg. tr. vb.	18	60.1%
Limiting adverbs	0	0
Inversion of subject -- predicate	6	35.2%
Proverbs	1	no figs.
Definite (known) object noun	26	55.6%
Infin. + 'independent' verb	11	no figs.
Imperative	2	53.7%
Interrogative	9	70.4%
Presence of kotoryj/który	1	52%
-a/-ja stem object noun	11	47.6%
Perfective neg. tr. vb.	20	40.1%
Double negative	2	22.2%

Conditions considered to favour gen. case choice	no. or % of accs.	
	Pol.	Russ.
Quantitative meaning of noun	0	1 acc. only
Presence of intensifiers of negation	1	4%
Verbs of desire, expection etc. Figs. given only for vbs. of perception.	2	19.8%
Fixed phrases and idioms	0	no figs.
Indefinite (unknown) object noun	3	55.6%
Infin. + mod. aux. vb.	5	no figs.
Formal (written) style	5	no figs.
Gerunds and participles	1 (marg.)	12%
Presence of imet' / mieć	3	2.6%
Object is abstract neuter adjectival noun	0	13%
Pronoun to	0	15%
Pronoun čto / co	1	23%
Object noun in plural	5	29.9%
Imperfective neg. tr. vb.	3	59.9%
ne vidno, ne slyšno / nie widać, nie słychać	o	1 acc./16 gen.

From the summary above, it is evident that even in our extremely small corpus of data on Polish, we found zero acc. occurrence for only six conditions in Polish, i.e., in the presence of limiting adverbs, where the noun has a quantitative meaning, in fixed phrases and idioms, where the object is a noun derived from a neuter abstract adjective, where the object is the pronoun to, and with the constructions nie widać, nie słychać. This compares with zero acc. occurrence for only one condition in Russian, the presence of limiting adverbs. Even for a small and not necessarily reliable body of data, these results for Polish are quite surprising, in view of the strength of the neg. gen. rule in standard Polish.

Looking at the more striking features of the table, it appears that Polish, like Russian, admits the acc. where the negated verb governs an infinitive, in particular, if the governing verb is 'independent' and not merely a modal auxiliary. It should be noted, also, that all cases of the acc. occurring in formal (i.e. written) style contain a governing verb phrase of some kind with an infinitive. This would bear out the statement in more recent books on Polish grammar, that infinitive constructions with a neg. tr. vb. are permissible with the acc. Interrogative sentences also appear to increase the chances of an acc. in Polish, as in Russian. Our results show that a/ja stem nouns favour acc. choice to some extent in Polish, however, we would refer the reader to the section in Chapter II on a/ja stem nouns where we expose the difficulties involved in accessing the true extent of the acc. with a/ja nouns as opposed, for example, to masc. anim. nouns.

Sentences containing definite nouns and perfectives have very high acc. ratio in Polish, higher than that in Russian - at least it appears so from our limited figures on Polish. Limiting adverbs produce a high gen. count

both in Russian and Polish, as does quantification of the noun. The presence of intensifiers of negation, and the ne vidno ne slyšno / nie widać, nie słychać constructions also encourage gen. case selection after the neg. tr. vb.

An important point to notice is that all but five of the Polish sentences seem to be colloquial in character, which illustrates the great difference between Polish and Russian with respect to case choice after neg. tr. vb. In Polish, apart from sentences containing an infin. + finite verb construction, acc. choice appears to be restricted mainly to colloquial usage.

IV. Conclusion.

1. It is clear from our material and from other studies, that a choice subject to certain restrictions exists between the acc. and gen. cases following the neg. tr. vb. in Russian. The choice in many cases appears to be superficially based on a considerable number of different factors, but in fact there seem to be broader underlying principles involved, which are difficult to pinpoint. We have found only four criteria upon which case selection can be made with satisfactory consistency: the gen. will be chosen

-- where the noun has a quantitative meaning;

-- where intensifiers of negation are present;

-- where the noun is governed by a gerund or participle;

-- with the constructions ne vidno, ne slyšno.

The factors which seem to favour use of the acc. are

-- the presence of indirect negation;

-- the presence of a proper noun in the object case;

-- the sentence is in the interrogative mood.

Regarding indirect negation, it has been suggested that in conjunction with an independent verb the infinitive is the only element negated. The governing verb is not negated and the object is in the acc. for this reason. Where the governing verb is a modal auxiliary, it has been said that both the infinitive and the verb are negated, due to their close syntactic association, thus the noun is usually in the gen. We have pointed out, however, the difficulty of assessing the 'independence' of a verb.

Proper nouns are normally individuated or 'known' (determinate), thus they would be expected to take the acc. after neg. tr. vb.

Negated questions are stylistically emphatic and do not usually have a negative meaning. On the contrary, negation in questions often implies expectation of a positive answer. The object in such utterances therefore tends to take the acc.

In the other categories examined for Russian it is usually unclear as to what extent they perform a role in case choice. Evaluation of their significance to case selection is severely complicated by the frequent simultanteous interaction of several criteria.

2. It is probable that the oppositions determinate/indeterminate, total/partial negation and the concept of individualization are key factors in determining case after neg. tr. vb. in Russian. Further study of these phenomena is required to assess their influence on case choice. Such study should include investigation of the function of accentuation, word order, emphasis and context.

3. It is normally thought that the genitive is the only permitted case following neg. tr. vb. in Polish. Our results do not corroborate this. We have found zero acc. occurrence after neg. tr. vb. for only six of the categories examined:

— the presence of a limiting adverb;

-- the noun has a quantitative meaning;

-- the phrases is a fixed phrase or idiom;

-- the object noun is derived from an abstract neuter adjective;

— the object is the pronoun <u>to</u>;

— the phrase contains the construction <u>nie widać, nie słychać</u>.

4. Polish shows similarity to Russian in encouraging acc. case selection(to a certain extent)under the following conditions:

— in the presence of indirect negation;

-- where the object is an a/ja stem noun;

-- where the object noun is determinate;

The only instance where Polish accepts the acc. following neg. tr. vb. in the literary language is with indirect negation.

The influence of a/ja stem nouns is difficult to assess for both Polish and Russian, due to morphological factors. A/ja stem nouns may not in reality have any influence on case choice in either of the two languages. For more detailed discussion of the problems involved we refer the reader to the section on this subject in Ch. II.

5. Unlike Russian, Polish appears to favour acc. case choice after neg. tr. vb. of the perfective aspect. Though this is often quoted as a condition for choosing the acc. in Russian, it does not in practice seem to be so, on the basis of the material we have studied.

6. Apart from the instance of indirect negation, all the examples of accs. following neg. tr. vb. that were available for our perusal originated from colloquial sources. Use of the acc. after neg. tr. vb. is still considered substandard in the great majority of cases in Polish, whatever its actual frequency in the colloquial language may be.

7. Our data on Polish was extremely limited. To establish the real position of the acc. in literary and spoken modern Polish, further study and collection of raw data are required. Two case counts would be of great value, one of extensive contemporary written texts, the other of spoken texts, preferably collected during the course of conversation on a tape-recorder, in order to eliminate conscious or unconscious self-correction by the speaker. The data could then be classified and examined in the same

way as in Russian to show how much the acc. is used in Polish following the neg. tr. vb., and which conditions particularly encourage it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Works cited in the text.

Akademija nauk SSSR. Institut russkogo jazyka. Grammatika russkogo jazyka. 2 vols. Moscow: Izd. Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 1960.

Borras, F.M., and R.F. Christian. Russian Syntax. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Buttler, Danuta, Halina Kurkowska and Halina Satkiewicz. Kultura języka polskiego. Zagadnienia poprawności grammatycznej. 2nd. ed. Warszawa: PWN, 1973.

Crockett, Dina B. "The Scope of Denial in Russian Negative Sentences." Lingua, 43 (1977), pp. 229-245.

Cygan, Jan. "Negation in English and Polish." In The Polish-English Contrastive Project. Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics. vol. II. Ed. Jacek Fisiak. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.; Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz Univ., 1974, pp. 295-329.

Davison, R. M. The Use of the Genitive in Negative Constructions (Studies in the Modern Russian Language 2.) Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1967.

Dobromyslov, V.A. and D. E. Rozental'. Trudnye voprosy grammatiki i pravopisanija. Moscow: Učpedgiz, 1955.

Doroszewski, Witold. O kulturę słowa. vol. II. Warszawa: (PWN), 1968.

Druien, Robert F. "The Case Form for and Object of a Negated Transitive Verb in Russian with Comments on Ukrainian Usage." DAI, 35 (1973), 429A (Michigan).

Finkel', A.M. and N.M. Bašenov. Sovremennyj russkij literaturnyj jazyk. Kiev: "Radjans'ka Škola"., 1951.

Fuchs, Anna. "Zur Wahl des Objektkasus bei Verneinung im Russischen". In Slavistische Studien zum VII. Internationalen Slavistenkongress in Warschau 1973. München: Tröfenik, 1973, pp. 81-91.

Gaertner, Henryk, A. Passendorfer and W. Kochański. Poradnik grammatyczny. Warszawa: Polski Zakład Wydawnictw Szkolnych , 1968.

Gladrow, W. "Das Zusammenwirken unterschiedlicher sprachlicher Mittel zum Ausdruck der Determiniertheit/Indeterminiertheit des Substantivs im Russischen." Zeitschrift für Slawistik, 17 (1972), pp. 647-656.

Kasjan, Jan Mirosław. Poetyka polskiej zagadki ludowej. Toruń: Univ. Mikołaja Kopernika, Rozprawy, 1976.

Keil, R.D. "Zur Wahl des Objektkasus im modernen Russisch" Zeitschrift fur slavische Philologie, 35 (1970), pp. 109-33.

Keil, R. D. "Zur Wahl des Objektkasus im modernen Russisch" Zeitschrift fur slavische Philologie, 35 (1970), pp. 109-33.

Korn, David. "Case Selection: Genitive or Accusative After Negation in Contemporary Russian?" Modern Language Review, 62 (1967), pp. 486-97.

Laskowski, Roman. Polnische Grammatik. Trans. W. Paschek. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna, 1972.

Listvinov, N.G. Voprosy stilistiki russkogo jazyka. 2nd ed. revised. Moscow: "Mysl'", 1965.

Magner, Thomas F. "Negation and Case Selection in Russian." Word, 11 (1955), pp. 531-541.

Morison, W.A. "Logical Stress and Grammatical Form in Russian." Slavonic and East European Review, 99 (1964), pp. 292-7.

Peskovskij, A.M. Russkij sintaksis v naučnom osveščenii. Moscow: Učpedgiz, 1956.

Pisarkowa: full name Harrer-Pisarkowa, K. "Przypadek Dopełnienia w polskim zdaniu zaprzeczonym." Język Polski, 39 (1959), pp. 9-32.

Pul'kina I., and E. Zaxava-Nekrasova. Russian. Trans. V. Korotky. Ed. R. Dixon. Moscow: Progress, n.d.

Ravič, R.D. "O vybore padeža prjamogo dopolnenija pri perexodnyx glagolax s otricaniem v russkom jazyke.", In Fonetika, fonologija grammatika. Moscow: Nauka, 1971. pp. 254-265

Restan, Per A. "The Objective Case in Negative Clauses in Russian: The Genitive or the Accusative?" Scando-Slavica VI, 1960, pp. 92-112.

Rozental' D. E. Modern Russian Usage. Trans. M. A. Green Ed. C. V. James. London: Pergamon, 1963.

----------. and M. A. Telenkova. Praktičeskaja stilistika russkogo jazyka. Practical stylistics of Russian. Trans. K. Villiers. Ed. V. Korotky. Moscow: Progress, n.d.

Šachmatov, A.A. Sintaksis russkogo jazyka. vol. I. Leningrad, 1925; rpt. The Hague: Mouton, 1963.

Safrewiczowa, Halina. "Forma Dopełnienia bliższego w rosyjskim zdaniu zaprzeczonym." Slavia Orientalis, VIII, No. 4 (1959), pp. 77-109 and IX, No. I (1960), pp. 69-137.

Schenker, Alexander M. Beginning Polish. vol. I. Rev. ed. New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 1973.

Szober, S. Grammatyka języka polskiego. 2nd ed. Ed. Witold Doroszewski. Warszawa: PWN, 1967.

Szwedek, Aleksander. "Some aspects of definiteness and indefiniteness of nouns in Polish." In The Polish-English Contrastive Project. Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics. Vol II. Ed. Jacek Fisiak. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.; Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz Univ., 1974, pp. 203-211.

Thomson, A. Beitrag zur Kasuslehre III. "Zur Genetivrektion des XXIX, Verbums im Baltischslawischen." Zeitschrift für indogermanische XXIX, Forschungen, Drittes und viertes Heft (1911-12), pp. 249-259.

Timberlake, Alan. "Hierarchies in the Genitive of Negation." Slavic and East European Journal, 19, No. 2 (1975), pp. 123-139.

Tsurikov, Alexey. Case selection in clauses with negative transitive verbs in contemporary Russian. PhD thesis U. of Rochester 1967. University Microfilms Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan (No. 67-13, 6S3).

Uglitsky, Zinaida. "Accusative and Genitive with Transitive Verbs preceded by a Negative in Contemporary Russian." Slavonic and E. European Review, XXXIV (1956), pp. 377-387.

Unbegaun, B.O. Russian Grammar. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.

Wexler, P. "On the non-lexical expression of determinedness (with special reference to Russ. and Finn.)." Studia Linguistica, 30 (1976), pp. 34-67.

Zagórska-Brooks, Maria. Polish Reference Grammar. The Hague - Paris: Mouton, 1975.

II. Works consulted but not cited in the text.

Bąk, Piotr. Gramatyka Języka Polskiego. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna, 1977.

Bogorodickij, V.A. Obščij kurs russkoj grammatiki. 5th ed. Gosudarstvennoe social 'no-ekonomičeskoe izdatel'stvo: Moscow, 1935.

Breza, Edward. "Niektóre częstsze błędy językowe." Polonistyka, 24, No. 1 (1971), pp. 42-48.

Butorin, D.I. "Ob osobyx slučajax upotreblenija vinitel'nogo prjamogo ob"ekta v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke." In Normy sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo slovoupotreblenija. Ed. G.A. Kačevskaja and K.S. Gorgačevic. Moscow: Nauka, 1966, pp.125-136.

Buttler, Danuta. Innowacje składniowe współczesnej polszczyzny. Warszawa: PWN, 1976.

----------. "Przyczyny niektórych zmian składniowych we współczesnej polszczyźnie." Prace filologiczne, 20 (1970), pp. 203-209.

Czachowska, Jadwiga and Jadwiga Puzynina. Bibliografia polskich prac z zakresu slawistyki. Vol. I. Warszawa: PWN, 1973.

Dončeva-Mareva, L. "Der Artikel, ein Ausdrucksmittel der Opposition 'Determiniertheit/Indeterminiertheit' und seine möglichen Äquivalente im Russischen (auf der Grundlage des Bulgarischen, Französischen und Englischen)." Zeitschrift für Slawistik, XI (1966), pp. 38-44.

Heinz, Adam. Genetivus w indo-europejskim systemie przypadkowym. Warszawa: PWN, 1955.

Isačenko, A. V. "Frazovoe udarenie i porjadok slov." In To Honour Roman Jakobson. Vol II. The Hague: Mouton, 1967, pp.967-976.

Imperatorskaja Akademia Nauk. " Opyt" obščesravnitel'noj grammatiki russkago jazyka. Ed. Ivan Davydov". St. Petersburg, 1854.

Jakobson, Roman. "Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre. Gesamtbedeutung der russischen Kasus." In Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague 6.; rpt. Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1968, pp.240-294.

Jespersen, Otto. Negation in English and Other Languages. Copenhagen: Bogtrykkerie, 1917.

Jodłowski, Stanisław. "Elementy semantyczne funkcji składniowych." In Problemy składni polskiej. Studia, dyskusje, polemiki z lat 1945 - 1970. Ed. Andrzej Maria Lewicki. Kraków: PWN, 1971, pp. 102 - 119.

----------. "O gramatycznej i stylistycznej funkcji szyku wyrazów." In Symbolae Linguisticae in Honorem Georgii Kuryłowicz. Warszawa: PAN (Komisja Językoznawstwa), 1969, pp. 152-8.

Karaś, Mieczysław. "O dzisiejszej polszczyźnie." Nauka dla wszystkich, No. 165. Kraków: PWN, 1972.

Kempf, Zdzisław. "O dopełnieniach bliższych i dalszych." Poradnik językowy, 6 (1972), pp. 341 - 350.

Klemensiewicz, Zenon. "Problematyka psychologicznej interpretacji zdania gramatycznego." In Ze studiów nad językiem i stylem. Warszawa: PWN, 1969, pp. 43-59.

Liewehr, Ferdinand. "Zur Negation im Slawischen." In Vorträge auf der Berliner Slawistentagung VIII. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956, pp. 243-250.

Lobanova, N.A. "Semantic Differentiation among Negative Sentence Variants." Slavonic and East European Journal, 19 (1975), pp. 200-4.

Łos, Jan, et al. Język Polski i jego historia z uwzględnieniem innych języków na ziemiach polskich. Kraków: Nakład Akademii i Umiejętności 1915.

Maryniak, I. "Dopełnienie bliższe przy czasownikach zaprzeczonych we współczesnym rosyjskim języku literackim." Slavia Orientalis, 8, No. 8 (1959), pp. 111 -119.

Meillet, A. "Sur le caractère de la phrase négative en vieux slave." Revue des Études Slaves, 8 (1928), pp. 171-177.

Miklošič, F. Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen. Vol. IV. 1874; rpt. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.

Miodek, Jan. "Ankieta poprawnościowa." Poradnik językowy, (1972), pp. 535-539.

Nikonov, V.A. "Bor'ba padežej." International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics, 3 (1961), pp. 13-33.

Pisarkowa - full name Harrer-Pisarkowa, K. "Składnia czasowników zaprzeczonych oraz czasowników dowiedzieć się, wysłuchać." Język Polski, 44 (1964), pp. 310-12.

Pospelov, N.S. "O sintaksičeskom vyraženii kategorii opredelennosti - neopredelennosti v soveremnnom russkom jazyke." In Issledovanija po sovremennomu russkomu jazyku. Moscow: Izdat. Moskovskogo Univ., 1970.

Puchmaner, Anton Jarosław. Lehrgebäude der Russischen Sprache. Prag, 1820.

Pul'kina, I.M. Kratkij spravočnik po russkoj grammatike. Moscow: Učpedgiz, 1961.

Saikiev, X.M. "Konstrukcii s vinitel'nym padežom v sovremennom russkom jazyke." In Voprosy izučenija russkogo jazyka. Alma-Ata: AN SSSR, 1955, pp. 11-66.

Saloni, Z. Błędy językowe w pracach pisemnych uczniów liceum ogólnokształcącego. Warszawa: PZWS, 1971.

Smirnitsky, A.I. Essentials of Russian grammar. 2nd ed. Ed. O.S, Axmanova. Moscow: Vysšaja Škola, 1975.

Swan, Oscar. "The Verb "Use" and the 'Expanding Accusative' in Polish." IJSLP XXI (1975), pp. 13-22.

Tokarski, Jan. "Język Polski w ostatnim pięćdziesięcioleciu." Poradnik językowy, 9 (1968), pp. 428-441.

Veyrenc, Jaques. "Existe-t-il un génitiv de l'object?" Bulletin de la Societé de Linguistique de Paris. (1972/1), pp. 215-38.

Vraciu, A. "Sur l'origine et l'évolution des fonctions syntaxiques de l'accusatif dans les langues slaves." Romanoslavica 16 (1968), pp. 161-74.

Wierzbicka, A. "Negacja - jej miejsce w strukturze głębokiej." Studia Filozoficzne. 4 (1969), pp. 103-116.

----------, and Piotr Wierzbicki. Praktyczna stylistyka. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna, 1968.

Zenčuk, V.N. "Ob odnom iz spornyx voprosov v svjazi s problemoj negacii v slavjanskix jazykax." In Slavjanskaja Filologija. 2nd ed. Vyp. II.
Leningrad: Leningrad Univ., 1972, pp.